National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. WITHOUT CONCEALMENT...WITHOUT COMPROMISE. EDMUND QUINCY, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. NO. 26. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1852. WHOLE NO. 650.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.

Selections.

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

[Reported for The Pennsylvania Freeman.]

The Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society convened in its Fifteenth Annual Meeting, at the Horticultural Hall in West Chester, Tenth mo. 25th, 1852. The assembly, which was large, was, at the opening of the meeting, mainly composed of the well-tried working Abolitionists of this and neighbouring States.

The President of the Society, James Mott, at 11 o'clock, took the chair and called the meeting to order.

In the absence of the Recording Secretary, on motion of J. M. McKim, C. M. Burleigh was appointed Secretary, and Dr. J. A. Rowland and Alice E. Hambleton Assistant Secretaries.

On motion of C. M. Burleigh, the following Business Committee was chosen: Oliver Johnson, Thos. Whitson, Mary Grew, M. B. Linton, W. L. Garrison, J. M. McKim and Lucretia Mott.

The following persons were appointed a Committee for the nomination of officers for the year ensuing:

Simon Barnard, Elizabeth R. Lewis, E. F. Pennypacker, Rebecca Pierce, Chandler Darlington.

On motion of J. M. McKim, it was voted that when the Society adjourns it be to meet again at 2 o'clock P. M.; and that the regular hours of meeting be at 9 1-2 and 2 P. M., and of adjournment at 12 1-2 and 5 P. M.; also, that meetings for addresses be held this evening and to-morrow evening at 7 o'clock.

Lucretia Mott remarked, that on coming together after a year's separation, it is natural that our religious feelings should be excited. While objections are felt to a formal service of prayer at the opening of our meeting, it is well that we all cultivate a prayerful spirit. Last year some of us came to our anniversary with saddened and anxious hearts, almost desponding in view of the persecutions we were witnessing and enduring for righteousness' sake. But our resolutions were as unyielding in principle, and as bold in spirit, as ever, a fact remarked by spectators. Now, those who have observed the fulfilment of our hopes and predictions come together rejoicing, and with songs of melody and thanksgiving in our hearts. It is meet that this feeling should awaken devotional aspiration, and find expression. She, therefore, proposed a brief period of silence.

After a short silence, Lucy Stone said: My friends, it seems to me that you who have been so long workers in this holy cause must feel that it is a religious spirit that animates the hearts and sustains the hands of its labourers, and that without this support their hands would hang down in despair. God's great heart is in our movement, giving it the vitality and power that it possesses.

Though this is the first time I have been among you, and most of your faces are strangers to me, I recognise in you the long-tried and true friends of the slave, who, on the frontiers of Slavery, and through peculiar trials, have been faithful to him. While the world around you has been scrambling for power, honour and gain, you have known that there is a higher power and honour, and a richer wealth, which moth and rust cannot corrupt, nor thieves take away. You who have worked so well, know the need of continued and increased labour. There are more slaves now in our country than ever before; Slavery is stretching out its territory and increasing its markets, and gaining more power. But while this is true, we also have cause for encouragement. While the political parties are bowing to the demands of Slavery, and the religious sects are joining hands with them to send the poor fugitive back to a life of torture and woe, we have new recruits coming to our help. Men and women, before inactive and silent, are coming as our coworkers, bravely to contend against the Wrong, while the slave's enemies are one by one falling and going to that bar where they must answer for their wrongs to him. Let us find where our strength is; in the arm of Him who is higher than the highest, and stronger than the strongest; then, though hand join in hand, their power shall be broken. A single human thought is stronger than they.

Lamartine said of Wilberforce, that he went up to the throne of God with a million of broken fetters in his hands. Let us labour to bear with us such trophies of our fidelity. There are fetters to break, not in the South alone, but in your own State. It has been truly said that Slavery has made it into another Guinea Coast. We want to see its people repudiate the Fugitive Slave Law. I want to see here such scenes as I saw at Syracuse in the great meeting to commemorate the rescue of Jerry from his hunters. [Here followed a touching narrative of the meeting between Captain Drayton and Frances Russell, one of the 77 fugitives of the schooner Pearl, and a sister of Emily Russell, who starved herself rather than be sent to the N. Orleans slave market.] The speaker went on to make an impressive appeal for Anti Slavery labour, enforcing it with pertinent facts and appropriate quotations. She did not agree with Gerrit Smith that this nation had sinned away its day of grace, and that its reform was hopeless; but she believed that if all who recognise the wrong of Slavery would join hands in the work, we might ere long present our country to the world, redeemed from this crying sin, a nation truly free and just. It only needed the firm purpose and steady toil; the faith and purpose that flattery cannot seduce, nor persecution haunt. Abolitionists must be men who "would not flatter Neptune for his trident, nor Jove for his power." They need that courage which, when the trial comes, as at Christiana, will be firm, by which they will choose the prison, or be hung, rather than falter.

Some one having expressed the desire that Mr. Garrison, who was too hoarse to speak, should go upon the platform, that the people might see if they could not hear him,

Lucretia Mott wished that we should not come together to glorify each other. Our platform is free for all, but let us call no one upon it to show himself merely as a spectacle to the meeting. Theodore Weld once replied to a proposal of a vote of honour to himself, "Let us strike a level above which no Abolitionist shall raise his head; let us drop a curtain behind which every Abolitionist shall work, and there dig his grave."

Joseph A. Dugdale, after remarking that he never felt more religious than in such a meeting as this, read several passages of Scripture, appropriate to the occasion, and offered vocal prayer.

The Society then adjourned to 2 o'clock, P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Society met as adjourned, the President taking the Chair.

The Treasurer's Report was read by the Secretary, as follows:

Pennsylvania State Anti-Slavery Society—Report for the Year ending 10 mo. 1st, 1852.

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, on last year's account	$66 89
Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society	1000 00
Clarkson	40 00
Individual subscriptions	2268 21
Loans, without interest	150 00
Rent	218 75
Sundries	113 50
Publishing Agent	2781 16
	6638 51
Balance due Treasurer	133 72
	$6771 23

PAYMENTS.

National Anti-Slavery Standard	$566 66
The Pennsylvania Freeman	3215 63
Salaries of Agents and Editors	2033 60
Rent of Office	359 00
Assistants in Office, Carriers, &c.	408 00
Sundries (including job printing, fuel, wrapping paper, &c.)	144 00
Post Office	53 34
	$6771 23

ABBY KIMBER, Treasurer.

Philadelphia, 10 mo. 1st, 1852.

The undersigned, appointed by the Executive Committee to audit the Treasurer's account, reports that the above abstract of the receipts and expenditures for the past year is correct; and that on the first of this month there was due the Treasurer a balance of $133 72. HAWORTH WETHERALD.

Philadelphia, 10 mo. 22, 1852.

The Fifteenth Annual Report of the Executive Committee to the Society was read by J. M. McKim, the Corresponding Secretary. It reviewed clearly and forcibly, and with some minuteness of detail, the history of the Anti-Slavery cause in the State, during the past year; drawing from that history lessons of encouragement and hope, to cheer us on in our work; and evidences that the wicked devices of our enemies had been overruled by an all-wise Providence to the promotion of our cause.

C. M. Burleigh moved that the Society instruct the Executive Committee to publish the Report in a pamphlet form. He regarded its historical facts as too important, and its comments as too pertinent and instructive, not to have a wider publication and more permant form than could be given them in this meeting.

Lucretia Mott suggested that the Report was open to criticism and discussion.

J. M. McKim thought such discussion and criticism desirable; that if the Report contained errors of fact or sentiment, they might be pointed out, and thus the opportunity be given for correction before it was printed.

Thomas Whitson objected to the admission in the Report that good might come out of evil, or that the wrong action of our enemies might have done service to our cause. He thought the cause had gone forward in *spite* of such acts, and that it would have gone forward more rapidly had these wicked acts never been performed. Had the coloured men who shot Gorsuch only resisted by moral power, refusing to serve the slaveholder and choosing to die themselves rather than submit to him, or kill him, it would have told more for Freedom than it did tell. Everything brings forth after its kind. God helps those who help themselves. We helped ourselves and God helped us, and let us not give the honour to our enemies, If we have triumphed over their wicked designs, it is owing to ourselves, not to them.

J. M. McKim remarked: The Report says that though good *may* have come from wrong action, there are moral obligations which forbid us to resort to such action. Thomas Whitson admits all that we claim, when he says that had the coloured people at Christiana acted differently, their action would have done more for freedom than it did, thus conceding that it did *something* for it. We believe, as he does, that God works by eternal laws, and that by one of those laws the evil purposes of bad men are over-ruled for good. It is God's eternal law that Truth uttered, whether by words, or dramatically in the facts of life, must have its appropriate effect. It is done in this case, by the atrocious law showing the character of Slavery, the responsibility of the North for it, and the danger arising from it to the rights of Northern men. Thus God "makes the wrath of men to praise him;" thus he "takes the wise in their craftiness, and carries the counsels of the froward headlong."

Dr. Trego hoped, whatever difference there might be concerning incidental expressions in the Report, that it would be published.

Wm. Webb thought the comparison of the action of the Free Democratic party with a slave insurrection was disrespectful.

J. M. McKim remarked that a passage of the Report concerning John P. Hale had been accidentally omitted in the reading. Its substance was, that while both Franklin Pierce and General Scott had publicly accepted the platforms of their parties, Mr. Hale had not accepted the Free Democratic platform, and that we had no evidence that he adopts its principles.

Thomas Whitson continued the discussion, defending its position and illustrating its views.

C. M. Burleigh asked if there was not in man's moral nature, as in his physical, a reactive power, by which cruelty and wrong stimulate it to greater activity, as a cold application to the surface of the body may increase its vital heat? May it not be that the Fugitive Slave Law itself, by its very atrocities, has awakened many men and women to active sympathy for the slave, and to actual opposition to Slavery and the slave law, who, but for its passage, might have remained indifferent to the subject? If so, has it not thus far been the means of working good? Harriet Beecher Stowe states that she was moved to write Uncle Tom's Cabin by the passage of this law. Could we measure precisely the amount of evil produced by the Law and of good wrought by the Book, and ascertain, as is probable, that the latter sum exceeds the former, might we not justly say that, with all its cruelty, the law has been the means of doing good? May it not be that thus "all things shall work together for good to such as love God?"

Lucretia Mott did not like the sentiment in the Report under discussion, and regretted its introduction. We should attribute all good to the Infinite Source of good. The evils of the Fugitive Slave Law are infinite. Ask the coloured people, whom it has scattered like sheep upon the mountains, what can compensate them for their sufferings and terrors and losses. See how it has corrupted the Northern people, and how easily men, at first shocked at it, have become reconciled to it. This speculation is incapable of demonstration. It opens a controversy without end. Is it not better to speak of evil as evil, not deducing from it any consequences which do not strictly belong to it? Does it not tend to weaken our abhorrence of wrong? There is nothing easier than to quote texts of Scripture in favour of any theory, as every sect supports its faith by such texts. I am not willing to admit that Harriet Beecher Stowe was moved to write Uncle Tom's Cabin by that law; if she says so, I think she mistakes the influences which have moved her. I believe, rather that it has been the moral sentiments and truths promulgated by the *Liberator*, the *National Era*, and the public discussion of the subject, upon her pure mind, exciting it to feel for the oppressed. If you point to the progress of our cause, through persecution, as evidence that the efforts of its enemies have helped it on, I have as good a right to say that but for these impediments, Slavery would have been abolished before now. I hope the Society will instruct the striking out of these passages of the Report.

J. M. McKim, while acknowledging the many and great evils of the Fugitive Law, was encouraged and made more hopeful by the proofs that it was working mischief to its inventors and their cause. It is an inspiring thought that God is supreme, and can turn the craftiness and malice of bad men against themselves. Without this confidence we might be disheartened and faint in view of the seeming triumphs of wrong. This principle has been recognised by the good of every age and nation. It is almost a universal conviction. That many persons have been stimulated to active Anti-Slavery efforts by the passage of the Fugitive Law, who were before indifferent or less active, is well known. Mrs. Stowe, as has been said, testifies that it prompted her to write Uncle Tom's Cabin, and I prefer to receive her statement to Mrs. Mott's unsustained supposition. Theodore Parker has been excited by it to far more zealous and efficient action. So is it with thousands of others. We heard Mr. Garrison remark, the other day, that a gift of a million of dollars to the Anti-Slavery treasury could not have done our cause so great a service.

Eli Hambleton thought if acts like the Fugitive Law promote our cause, we should not regret them, but should try to multiply them.

Mary Grew regretted the theological character of the discussoin. The question, she said, resolves itself into this: whether Satan is in the grasp of God; whether Good is mightier than Evil; whether God in his councils and purposes can be defeated by wicked men, or is able to bring their schemes into confusion and break their covenants of sin; whether, whatever man may do, God cannot and will not overrule all for the ultimate good of his creatures and order of his universe? That the Fugitive Law has done evil, is known; but if you had no theory to maintain, you must also admit that it has done some good. It has shown to thousands the ugliness and loathsomeness of Slavery, unseen before; it has caused a healthy abhorrence and indignation against the whole system, of which this is a fruit. It is because that wrong must ever be self-defeating; because all the mighty enginery of earth cannot prevail against the omniscience and omnipotence of God, that we trust confidently in our success. It is because we believe that God holds Satan under his control, and himself governs the Universe.

After a few more words from Thomas Whitson, an evening meeting was appointed for addresses from Lucy Stone and Mary Grew, and the Society adjourned until to-morrow morning at half past nine o'clock.

The meeting through the day had continued to increase in attendance, until the large hall was well filled by a highly intelligent audience, who listened with close attention and deep interest to the Report and the discussions upon it.

In the evening, the hall was crowded, a large proportion of the audience being citizens of West Chester. Impressive addresses were given by Mary Grew and Lucy Stone, and were evidently received with much favour by the assembly.

THIRD DAY MORNING.

The Society met, as adjourned, the President taking the Chair. The minutes of yesterday's meeting having been read by the Secretary, the motion to publish the Annual Report in pamphlet form was adopted unanimously. The business committee, through its chairman, Oliver Johnson, presented the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That, under a deep sense of our dependence upon the God of Justice and Truth, in whose strength alone are we qualified to engage successfully in a moral conflict with oppression and wrong, we joyfully embrace the opportunity now afforded us to re-affirm before our country and the world, in the light of another year's experience, our abiding conviction of the soundness of the principles upon which our Society is based and of the wisdom of the measures we have hitherto pursued for the overthrow of Slavery.

2. Resolved, That, however visionary our plans and purposes may appear to those whose sense of justice is blinded by interest or warped by passion, and however our motives may be impeached or our reputation assailed, we must continue to proclaim in the ears of our countrymen the duty and safety of Immediate Emancipation, and the right of the slaves to freedom and a home upon the American soil.

3d. Resolved, That we reject as absurd and impious the doctrine so often promulgated from the Pulpit and the Press of this country, and there is a conflict between the claims of abstract justice and the rights of the slaves on the one hand, and the interests and welfare of the people on the other; and as sert, on the contrary, the Divine law of Human Brotherhood—that what justice demands for the oppressed, it demands, not for their sakes alone, but for the conservation of free institutions and of all that pertains to the rights and the happiness of the whole people.

4. Resolved, That he is neither a true patriot nor a true christian, but an enemy to God and the human race, who teaches his countrymen to enslave their fellow-men in order to ensure the stability of a free government, and to restore the fugitive slave to his master in order to fulfil the compromises of the Constitution; and that if there be any sacredness in the commands of God, or any truth in the monitions of history, the direct tendency of such teachings is to deaden the sympathies, harden the hearts, and blunt the moral sense of the people, and lead the nation to swift destruction.

5. Resolved, That we have signal cause for rejoicing in the fact, that the dark and threatening cloud which hung over our pathway at the time of our last Anniversary is now happily dispelled; that the efforts of the Chief Magistrate of the country, and others in authority, to revive, for the defense of chattel Slavery, the odious doctrine of Constructive Treason, to put down the Anti-Slavery movement, and blot out the hopes of the enslaved by the terrors of the dungeon and the gibbet, have proved abortive; and that the American People are becoming slowly but surely, and are gradually opening their eyes to the truth, that its existence is as incompatible with their own interests and welfare as it is with the law of God and the inalienable rights of its victims.

6. Resolved, That we pronounce the Fugitive Slave Law a masterpiece of Legislative iniquity, infamous alike in its origin and objects; that the attempts of the two great political parties of the country to make it a 'finality,' to silence all discussion of its provisions and all opposition to its inhuman workings, are an insult alike to the intelligence of the American People and the Spirit of the age; and that, in view of the utter impotency of all such efforts and of the constant increase of Anti-Slavery agitation, we may well indulge the hope that, by the might of a Public Opinion more potent that any legislative decree, it has become practically a DEAD LETTER upon the statute book.

7. Resolved, That in the failure of Daniel Webster, Millard Fillmore, James Buchanan, Geo. M. Dallas, Lewis Cass, and Stephen A. Douglass, to secure a nomination for the Presidency as the reward of degrading and competitive subserviency to the slave power, we witness a signal exhibition of retributive justice, and that, notwithstanding the Conventions of the Whig and Democratic parties made Slavery the 'head of the corner' in the construction of their respective platforms, we have occasion to rejoice in the fact, that large numbers of the people who belong to those parties at the North are giving unmistakable indications that they do not mean to be bound by the pledges of their leaders, and that, whoever may be elected to the Presidency, they do not intend to relinquish the freedom of speech and the press, nor bow their heads under the yoke of the slaveholders.

8. Resolved, That, independent of all questions as to the meaning of particular clauses of the Constitution, and whether it be admitted or denied that it contains certain guarantees for the benefit of Slavery, the effort to establish a Union between States that are slaveholding and States that are free must in the nature of things be abortive, since the legislation demanded by the former is diametrically opposed to that required by the latter; and therefore we reiterate the doctrine of the American Anti-Slavery Society, 'NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.'

9. Resolved, That the scheme of African Colonisation, as prosecuted by the American Colonisation Society and its auxiliaries, being founded upon an unreasonable and unholy prejudice, and virtually denying, as it does, the equal brotherhood of those who wear a dark complexion, continues to excite our deepest abhorrence; and that, in view of the extraordinary efforts of its supporters to impart to it new life and vigour, and especially in view of the sanction recently given it by the Legislature of Pennsylvania in the conditional contribution of funds to its treasury, we deem it our duty to lift up anew, and with undiminished earnestness, our testimony against it, and to claim for our coloured fellow-citizens, both bond and free, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness upon this their native soil.

10. Resolved, That, in view of the increasing willingness of the people of our State to read Anti-Slavery books and papers, and to listen to Anti-Slavery speeches, it will be our duty during the coming year to make a vigorous effort to extend the circulation of *The Pennsylvania Freeman* and other Anti-Slavery journals, and sustain as many qualified lecturers as our ability will allow, that by these means the gospel of Anti-Slavery may be widely diffused, and our State and Nation be redeemed as speedily as possible from their bondage to the Slave Power.

The resolutions were accepted for discussion, and on motion of O. Johnson, it was voted to take them up separately for action.

The first resolution was taken up and read by the Secretary.

Oliver Johnson, though not able to take part in the discussion, invited the utmost freedom of remark by all present. He thought there was danger that we should wait too much for the speakers who were among us from abroad, and take too little personal interest and responsibility in the work of the meeting.

Lucretia Mott moved the adoption of the resolution. Chandler Darlington remarked that the resolution commended the wisdom of the measures the Society has hitherto pursued. The Society had changed its measures since its formation. It formerly went for political action but now it condemns it. How then can it approve the wisdom of its former measures?

Oliver Johnson replied, that the Society did not disparage political action, except such as is inconsistent with Anti-Slavery fidelity. It did condemn such action, under the Constitution of this Union, as binds us to sustain its pro-slavery Compromises, but no other. He saw no evidence that we had changed our ground in any other way than that we had found a new application of our principles, another bond holding us to the slave system.

Chandler Darlington said the Society had once encouraged voting, but now discouraged it. The Declaration of Sentiment had commended political action.

C. M. Burleigh saw no inconsistency in our approval of our past course of action, admitting that we had changed. Our aim from the beginning had been to clear ourselves from all responsibility for Slavery, and take the most effectual course for its abolition If in our progress we had found that for this end we must change our action in some respects, that very change was proof of fidelity to our cause, and matter for future commendation. But the Society had never commended voting nor encouraged it. An incidental approval of political action was very far from an approval of an Anti-Slavery party, or of voting at all under the Constitution of our country. There were other kinds of political action besides holding office or voting men into office.

Mrs. Mott believed the Society had never pursued the measure of voting. Our measures, as described in the Declaration of Sentiment adopted at the formation of the American Anti-Slavery Society, were to organize Anti-Slavery Societies, to send forth agents; to circulate books, tracts and periodicals: to seek to enlist the pulpit and the press in the cause of the suffering and the dumb; to aim at the purification of the churches from the guilt of Slavery; and to encourage the labour of freemen instead of slaves. Nothing was said of voting, and probably nothing was thought of it. Whatever acts upon the parties and politics of the country is thus far *political action* Our exhibition of the political and economical evils of Slavery and advantages of Freedom, our exposure of the aggressions of the slave power in and through the government, are such.

W. L. Garrison said: I have the reputation of being a very rash man, and deserve it this morning in attempting to speak, while suffering as I am from soreness of my throat and lungs. Being the author of the Declaration of Sentiment, I may be supposed to know its meaning as it lay in the mind of the author. It laid down certain great principles and general measures, but it could not define every duty or measure which lay before us. It left it to each successive hour to reveal its peculiar duties in the light of these principles. We could not see the end from the beginning. Our duty was to see to it that we, in no way, compromised the rights of the Slave. Our friend will not say that the Declaration of Sentiment requires us to do a pro-Slavery act. On the contrary, it lays on us the strongest injunctions to make our position, our words and action, our entire influence, Anti-Slavery. We resolved to attempt the purification of the church; but who believes that this implied we must become church-members? So we resolved to aim to purify the government, but did this any more imply that we must become members of the government? Every man must judge for himself of both those relations, whether they would conpromise the rights of the Slave or not. To his own master he must stand or fall.

The position of this Society upon the Constitution is well known. We hold that it contains certain wicked compromises of the rights of the slave. It gives the slaveholders a political representation for their slaves, thus bribing them to hold and multiply their human chattels.- I cannot swear to give such power to slaveholders. Does our Declaration of Sentiment require me to do it? On the contrary, its principles and spirit forbid such an oath. So of the obligation to put down a slave insurrection and return fugitive slaves. To be faithful to the principles of that Declaration, I must stand outside of a government or that the church of which I am a member is pro-Slavery, as I recognise its Christian character by that membership, I must stand outside the church.

Yet I may exert both a political and religious influence. He is not the only politician who votes. The man is the greatest politician who exerts the greatest political influence, who does most to shape the character and policy of the government, though he never votes. Our friend need not be apprehensive that we shall cease to influence the government when we cease to vote. No persons are more vigilant of the action of the government and the political parties than the no-voting Abolitionists. I believe none do more to make Free Soil votes. Where are the most Free Soil votes cast? As a general fact, just where there are most Abolitionists disfranchised for conscience sake and the slave's sake.

The Devil of temptation always says, "Do a little evil to do a great good. It is the best we can do under circumstances. They are bad. I wish they were better, but we must take them as they are and yield to them." Now this is false and fatal counsel. I have no right to take a false position, or do an immoral act to put down Slavery.

Why should not Abolitionists be satisfied with their principles and position? Their principles are acknowledged by the nation and the church as true, though they do violate them daily. The Abolitionists are honest men, their opponents are dishonest; the Abolitionists are consistent; others are inconsistent; they are pious and christian men; their enemies are impious and unchristian men. Both we and our opponents assert that "all men are created equal." We try to carry out the principle, and they treat it with contempt and disregard. This Anti-Slavery movement is a new advent of Jesus of Nazareth. In it he is applying new tests to the people and church. The rulers have not believed on it. Captain Rynders and his ruffian club mob it. The parties and churches and mobs are combined to crucify the Anti-Slavery Messiah.

You may not look for the true Christian church, or the true Christian ministry, outside the Anti-Slavery cause. It is animated by the same spirit and sustained by the same power, as was the great Christian Reform of eighteen centuries ago. God is moving in it, and therefore nothing can intimidate us or stay its progress. When a man like Daniel Webster seeks to crush it, he lifts his puny arm against God.

We have seen much during the past year to encourage us. Even in the action of the Baltimore Conventions there are hopeful signs.

It is a significant and instructive fact that every candidate for the nomination who had sought the office by extraordinary devotion to the slave power was defeated. It is well known also that General Scott was not the candidate of the South. For fifty-three ballotings they went in a body for Millard Fillmore, and for fifty-three times, the North said, No! For the first time the North stood firm and triumphed. This is no reason that any Abolitionist should vote for Scott, but it is still a mark of progress. Then, that sixty-six men should vote against the Whig platform with the certainty that their success would insure the defeat of their party, is unprecedented in the history of the two parties of the country.

We cannot vote for either Scott, Pierce or Hale, for neither occupies a position in which an Abolitionist can stand. Neither the Free Democratic Party nor Mr. Hale demands the abolition of the slave representation or of the provision in the Constitution for the returning of fugitive slaves, It is true they call for a jury trial for them; but is this Anti-Slavery, to give to a jury the power to doom innocent men and women to Slavery? Never can we in the remotest manner acknowledge such a right. What matters it to the fugitive, whether a jury or a commissioner delivers him to his hunter? It is our duty and purpose to claim liberty for the slaves, and deny the right of any power, through any forms, to send back to Slavery those who have fled from it.

At the close of Mr. Garrison's speech, the first resolution was adopted and resolution No. 2 was taken up and read, and ably discussed by Mrs. Mott, Wm. H. Topp, of Albany, New York, and Thomas Whitson.

The importance of Abolitionists pressing more upon the public mind their great foundation principle, *Immediate Emancipation without expatriation*, was urged.

Mr. Topp condemned in strong terms the Colonisation Society, and spoke with the earnestness and feeling learned from a painful experience, of the cruelty and injustice towards the people of colour, fostered by that Society, calling upon every Abolitionist to maintain not only the right and duty of immediate emancipation, but the right of every coloured man to a home here as a freeman upon his native soil. He stated that he was a member of the Free Democracy, and should vote for Mr. Hale, and with an impressive sincerity and candour of manner he briefly gave his reasons for so doing, desiring to hear this matter further discussed, that he and other sincere Abolitionists in his position might be set right, if wrong.

Thomas Whitson replied forcibly to the inquiries of Mr. Topp, showing that an adherence to the United States Constitution was incompatible with the principle of *immediate emancipation*, as that was a compact to protect Slavery for a time longer. When we empannel a jury, he continued, to try the right of a man to freedom, we compromise that principle. We should never permit the question to be considered. It is blasphemous to consider it. I would as soon be consigned to Slavery by Ingraham as by a jury. There is doubtless a great difference between the character of the Free Democratic candidate and that of Pierce or Scott, but in the position of agreeing to wrong they are alike. They all compromise principle for the present advantage to their party. If all the world should vote a wrong principle right, or a right principle wrong, it would do nothing to prove it true. The pirate himself does not perpetrate a greater outrage than Ingraham. Any one of us would choose death rather than that fate. Our principles compel us to reject the religion and the politics which sanction such abominations. We demand the liberty of a man, law or no law, Constitution or no Constitution. I see men whom I love, men who are too good for their position, joining in political action under this Government. But this is a question of principles, not *men*. The Constitution protects the institutions of the several States, Slavery included, it delivers the runaway slave to his master. Now if the contract is good, let us keep it in good faith; if bad, let us discard it openly.

Some allusion being made to Charles Sumner, one of the audience asked if Mr. Sumner did not procure the release of Captains Drayton and Sayres?

Mr. Garrison replied: What if he did? Does it prove his position sound as a Senator of the United States, or that it is moral to swear to sustain the Constitution? A man may do many good and Anti-Slavery acts, while his position is pro-Slavery.

God forbid that I should take a leaf from the laurels of Mr. Sumner, but honour should be rendered to whom it is due. While much credit is due to Mr. Sumner for his efforts for the release of Capts. Drayton and Sayres, that release was not primarily owing to him. Paradoxical as it may seem, those men were probably largely indebted for their deliverance to Lewis Cass and Stephen A. Douglass. These gentlemen had made eloquent speeches in favour of the intercession of this Government for the pardon of O'Brien, Meagher and Mitchell. The Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, by way of kindling a back fire upon Slavery, sent a memorial to the Senate asking for similar action in behalf of Drayton and Sayres. This memorial Mr. Sumner, to whom it was sent, never presented. But a few days later, while he had it in his pocket, Senator Clarke, of Rhode Island, presented a memorial precisely similar, from Anti-Slavery men in Rhode Island, which was respectfully received, referred and reported on. Mr. Sumner remained in Washington from December to April, without ever calling upon Capts. Drayton and Sayres, or expressing in any way to them his sympathy for them. In the mean time active efforts were made by their friends in many parts of the country to procure their pardon. I forebore, in the *Liberator*, to criticise Mr. Sumner's silence or his neglect to present our memorial, until one of the petitioners wrote to me for information respecting it, and I published his letter with brief comments. Then Mr. Sumner went to Drayton and Sayres and represented to them that it would be inexpedient to present the memorial, and they of President, and he consented to grant the pardon, if his power to do so were proved to him. Mr. S. furnished a satisfactory argument and the pardon was granted. Mr. Garrison continued at some length in support of the resolution, showing immediate emancipation to be the only Christian or safe principle for the slaveholder.

The President stated that the pardon of Capts. Drayton and Sayres was due in a great measure to the efforts of Capt. Drayton's wife, who spent weeks and months in going to the prosecutors and procuring their consent for his liberation. Prof. Cleveland, of Philadelphia, had also been very active in his exertions for the same object.

J. M. McKim added that no man had been more untiring and faithful in his exertions in behalf of those prisoners, than our late friend Nathan Evans, who should never be forgotten in the acknowledgments for their release.

Mr. McKim alluded also to Mr. Topp's remarks on political action, expressing much pleasure at their spirit. It was the spirit of many others, who took similar ground. The partizan spirit is passing away. Now our difference is of opinion merely; and sometimes not even that. Some of our voting friends confess that we are right in principles; but they cannot resist the temptation to vote under the peculiar circumstances of every election. Expediency is their plea: so it is with Whigs and Democrats. But upon grounds of expediency alone our course is wise. Its policy is as clear as its principle. Our numbers are insignificant and contemptible compared with the great parties. As moral reformers, our power depends not on numbers, and though few, we are mightier than they. But instead of awing the South by a display of numbers at the ballot-box, we only show our weakness. Such a display misrepresents the Abolitionists. The South regards it as the whole Anti-Slavery force: whereas it we made no display of numbers, our power and numbers would be estimated by the proofs of our influence. Therefore, if any party has a right to complain of bad policy, it is we who may do it of our political friends. Their action has done our cause serious damage. In the beginning of our movement we took no ground upon voting, and said little or nothing about it, but left every man to vote as he pleased. In the progress of our movement, new duties have been shown us, and among them that of going out of pro-slavery parties and a pro-slavery government. Yet in some sense we are all politicians. We deal with government, laws, parties and politicians, and they feel our influence. The Free Democrats of Syracuse, N. Y., were unwilling for Lucy Stone to leave there to attend our meetings, for they said her speeches made the people so abhor slavery, that while she persuaded some Free Democrats to be consistent Abolitionists, she induced more Whigs and Democrats to become Free Democrats.

Mr. Garrison said, that of all the Free Soil members of Congress, Mr. Giddings was the most faithful, and that he was always ready to welcome such speakers as Mr. Rillsbury and Mr. and Mrs. Foster, as lecturers in his district; for though they did not spare him, they made an Anti-Slavery sentiment there, which would sustain him. He knows that they are unsurpassed in beating the bush, and he is very adroit in catching the birds. Jesus said, "If I be lifted up, I will draw all men unto me." So, if we stand on the high ground of principle, we shall raise those around us; but if we stand on the dead level of expediency, we can raise none above it.

J. M. McKim pointed to the fact that while we had been charged with throwing away the staff of accomplishment, our meetings here, in New York and Boston, were larger and more effective than political Anti-Slavery meetings. What Free Soil man wishes that we shall abandon our position? Who of them would have Mr. Garrison go into a political party? James G. Birney was once a powerful advocate of our cause; he became a politician, and he is now a dead man morally.

W. H. Topp said, I don't go for expediency, but for moral principle. I vote because I think I can do good by voting. Convince me that principle forbids me to vote, and I shall take your ground. I would not have Mr. Garrison join our party, because it would be coming down for him, and he can do more good where he is. Birney has fallen, and, as has been said, is dead morally and politically too. The position of the Free Democrats is not well understood. Their platform demands the entire abolition of Slavery where Congress has control.

Mr. Garrison remarked that while Scott and Pierce had accepted the platforms of their parties, Mr. Hale had not accepted that of his.

Mr. Topp replied that Mr. Hale was understood to approve it. Gerrit Smith had urged the Liberty Party to nominate Mr. Hale, and he could have known Mr. Hale's views or he would not have done it. I know the preaching of Lucy Stone at Syracuse has done good, in bringing Whigs and Democrats out of their parties into ours, and I wish you could continue your work.

On motion of Mary Grew, it was voted that the subject of Finance be made the order of the day for half past three o'clock this afternoon, and that F. Pennypacker, B. C. Bacon, Edward Webb and Abby Kimber be the Finance Committee.

Adjourned to 2 P. M

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Society met as adjourned, the President in the chair.

After some remarks by the President upon the indecorous practice of using tobacco in public meetings

The Nominating Committee reported the following list of officers to the Society, for the ensuing year, which was unanimously adopted:

President—James Mott.
Vice Presidents—E. M. Davis, B. C. Bacon.
Corresponding Secretary—J. M. McKim.
Recording Secretary—Haworth Wetherald.
Treasurer—Sarah Pugh.

Additional members of the Executive Committee: Lucretia Mott, Robert Purvis, Mary Grew, Oliver Johnson, Margaret Jones, E. F. Pennypacker, Abby Kimber, and C. M. Burleigh.

The 2d resolution was further sustained by Levi Coates, and passed without dissent. No. 3 was then read, and unanimously adopted. No. 4 was taken up, and supported at length and with much power and eloquence by Mr. Garrison, Lucy Stone, Mary Grew and others.

Mr. Garrison believed that if any objection could be made to the resolution, it was to its softness of language. What could be gentler than to say it was not truly Christian or patriotic to enslave men? Why, it is villainous. It is diabolism. We might as well talk of an honest thief or a sober drunkard as a Christian slaveholder. To enslave men to promote free institutions is not simply wicked, it is insanity. It belongs to Bedlam. To sustain the Fugitive Slave law to execute the Constitution is practical blasphemy. It is deifying the Constitution and dethroning Jehovah.

Lucy Stone supposed, when she heard the resolution, that the language was made thus tame, because it was the practice in this country to recognise slaveholders as Christians. It is done in the church and in society. Ninety-nine in every hundred of the people do not question a man's Christian character because he is a slaveholder. The speaker narrated several facts sustaining her statement, and showing that the leaders and prominent members of almost every religious sect, not excepting the Society of Friends, accord the Christian name to slaveholders, and that they were unhesitatingly received to Northern pulpits and communion tables. In Massachusetts she had seen Methodists engaged in the manufacture of slave-whips for the South. When she asked if they were really intended for that use, the pious manufacturers had admitted it, and had shown her the different kinds of whips employed, explaining their various merits. Those which were most popular and most in demand were so formed as to cause the keenest suffering, with the least mangling and bruising of the body. Lately, the Rev. Dr. Fuller, of Baltimore, who boasts that he owns sixty human beings as his slaves, visited Massachusetts, and Dr. Sharpe and other prominent Baptist clergyman there, instead of reproving him and calling him to repentance, welcomed him to their pulpits. In the same way are Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Methodist men-stealers admitted to Northern pulpits.

Now we would write down the men who enslave and traffic in human beings as unfit for the church the spirit of Christ, and "He that hath not the spirit of Christ is none of his."

"Just God and Holy,
Is that church which lends
Strength to the spoiler, thine?"

If the churches were to take the same ground as the English churches have taken; if they would say to the slaveholder, as Isaiah would say, "Break every yoke; let the oppressed go free; wash you, make you clean," then we will receive you, not before; if they would like Paul refuse to keep company with extortioners—the worst of extortioners—even so much as to eat with them, Slavery must soon fall. But the churches and people of the North have not thus testified for a pure religion. After Dr. Dewey had publicly proclaimed his readiness to send his own mother into Slavery, rather than endanger the Union, by the violation of the Fugitive Slave Law (O, he ought not to have had a mother! He ought not to have been born!), and after he was rewarded by being made Chaplain to the navy, he was invited to New Bedford to lecture before the Lyceum, and paid five hundred dollars for five lectures. Had he stolen but one pint of oil from one of those rich storehouses, by which to write his lectures, he would have been driven from the place with execrations. But as he only promised to send his mother to the pollution and torture of the slave system, he was rewarded with honour and office and gold.

The speaker pursued this train of remark with marked effect, showing the irreparable injury done by the example of this nation, to the cause of pure religion and of Liberty in other lands; that while we held this false position, we were, practically, the worst enemies of Christianity and republican freedom; and summoning every American, by his love to his country, by his devotion to freedom, and his duty to Christ, to join in the effort to free our country from its giant sin and curse.

Mary Grew said that Abolitionists were asked why they were not content without denouncing the Church. The reason is so apparent and pressing that we cannot keep sil

nough. When the Church buys, sells, and heathenizes God's children, and blasphemously appeals to the name of Christ as its sanction, no language is strong enough to describe it. Talk of their piety! Though their prayers were longer than the Pharisees', and their praises were solemn and unceasing, it is all a mockery while they trample on God's image. Judge ye, therefore, what is Christianity, and give not the holy name to that which violates its laws and has none of its spirit.

The discussion was continued by W. Thorne and T. Hambleton until 3 1-2 o'clock, when the 4th resolution was adopted, and the finance subject taken up.

While the Committee collected pledges and donations, J. M. McKim stated the needs of the Society, and urged the importance of increased contributions to meet the increased expenses, resulting from an enlargement of its operations.

Robert Douglass, by request, sung "There's a Good Time Coming."

Thomas Whitson proposed that we raise $1,000 at this meeting, and appealed to every Abolitionist to do his part in the work.

Mr. Garrison believed that there was no part of our operations that the slaveholders watched so narrowly as what Kossuth would call the 'material aid.' We cannot give charitably to this cause: we are debtors to it, and if we discharge this debt, we are indeed most fortunate. Our enterprise includes all others. It is an Education Society, for the instruction of thousands debarred from all knowledge; it is a Missionary Society, to carry the Christian Gospel to a nation of heathens in our midst; it is the true American Bible Society, seeking to give the Bible to a million of families to whom Slavery forbids it; it is a Society to promote moral purity and the sacredness of marriage, and check the tide of pollution that is flooding the land; it is a Society for the promotion of Temperance, by removing a system of idleness, profligacy and self-indulgence, most fruitful of intemperance; it is a Tract Society, scattering in its course the messages of the glad tidings which proclaim deliverance to the captive. Our movement is eminently a religious movement. Now the religion of the country is the great prop of Slavery. Its whole head is sick and its whole heart is faint. The public sentiment is corrupted by it. The pulpit and the [press are leagued with the tyrant. While the Anti-Slavery presses may almost be counted on your fingers, the name of the pro-slavery presses is Legion. There is no village or town in the land that is yet Abolitionized. The Theological Seminaries and Colleges of the country, with rare exceptions, are on the side of Slavery. The great religious denominations are against us. The depraved public sentiment of the nation is illustrated in the eulogies of Daniel Webster, a man whose private life was to be abhorred, a man notoriously an inebriate and profligate, whose immoralities are not to be named, and who had publicly never spoken one word in behalf of impartial liberty, and had done all in his power to humble New England at the foot of the Slave Power. The treason of Benedict Arnold fades into whiteness beside him, and I doubt not Judas will stand better at the bar of God than he. Yet he is now lauded all over the land as a statesman, a patriot, and a true Christian—an example for the imitation of young men.

Mr. G. continued in warm commendation of the devotion and zeal of this Society, its organ and editor, and urging every man who abhorred Slavery to join in sustaining and encouraging their operations.

Mrs. Mott recommended the Anti-Slavery Fair to the patronage and assistance of all friends of the Cause, stating that the Female Anti-Slavery Society in the city, and our friends in Europe were actively engaged in preparations for it. In conclusion, she offered the following resolution in behalf of the Fair, which passed unanimously.

Resolved, That we earnestly request the active cooperation of the Abolitionists of Pennsylvania in the Anti-Slavery Fair of this State, believing it to be an important department of Anti-Slavery labour, whether we regard it in its pecuniary or moral aspect.

The 5th resolution was taken up and discussed briefly by Mrs. Mott, Ira Gibson and others. Under it, Dr. Stebbins introduced a discussion upon the course of Messrs. Hale and Sumner in the Senate, defending their action as all that any Anti-Slavery men could do in their situation. Dr. S. was replied to briefly by Mr. Garrison and C. M. Burleigh, when the Society adjourned to half-past nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

The meeting through the day had been numerously attended, the afternoon session being much the proceedings and discussions. Through the evening, also, the hall was crowded with an intelligent audience, who received the addresses of Mr. Garrison and Lucy Stone with strong demonstrations of pleasure and sympathy.

FOURTH DAY MORNING.

The Society met as adjourned, the President taking the Chair. The minutes of yesterday's meeting having been read by the Secretary, the resolutions below were introduced by the Business Committee.

11. Resolved, That in the seizure and abduction, as slaves, of Rachel and Elizabeth Parker, free, native inhabitants of Pennsylvania, and in the murder of Joseph C. Miller, a peaceable citizen of our State, for his efforts to rescue them from the hands of the kidnappers, and in other similar cases, we see the natural fruits of Slavery, and that, in the indifference of the great mass of our citizens to such outrages, we see an example of the debasing influence of a Union which leaves one class of persons a prey to the cupidity of another, and permits immortal children of God to be bought and sold like brute beasts in the shambles.

12. Resolved, That in the pardon, by Gov. Bigler, of that Barabbas in crime, George F. Alberti, the convicted kidnapper, in humble obedience to the insolent demands of a slave-holding State, Pennsylvania was disgraced, and the 'lip of her honour laid low in the dust,' and that so monstrous a perversion of executive trust is a dark stain on the memory of Gov. Bigler.

13. Resolved, That we recommend to all Abolitionists to strive to maintain their consistency by abstinence from the purchase and use of the products of the slave's extorted and unrequited labour.

Further appeals were made for funds by Thomas Whitson—who again earnestly pressed the necessity of raising $1000 at this meeting—and Mary Grew, who exhorted Abolitionists to give the slaveholder an example of willingness to make sacrifices while asking him to make them.

Mr. McKim stated that the increased expenses of the Society were owing entirely to the enlargement of its opertions and of the paper.

The 5th resolution passed without dissent. The 10th, commending the *Freeman* and other Anti-Slavery papers, was called up and read.

J. M. McKim urged the claims of the *Freeman* upon the Anti-Slavery public, as one of our most efficient instrumentalities. In answer to the question, Why does not the *Freeman* support itself? he explained that, unlike most weekly papers, it had very few advertisements, thus increasing its cost while lessening its income, and that its unpopular doctrines and manly spirit had limited its circulation, while papers which flatter popular views and pander to public prejudices will flourish. But this fact should make every lover of liberty and virtue the more resolute and active to sustain a paper so free and fearless, so honest and reliable.

The resolution was then adopted unanimously, and the following were introduced by the Business Committee.

14. Resolved, That the purpose of the Anti-Slavery movement is not merely to repel the aggressions of the Slave Power upon the rights of Northern men, nor to seek the modification or repeal of the Fugitive Slave Bill, nor to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia, nor to prevent the further extension of the slave system; but it is, primarily, unalterably and absolutely, to liberate every slave on the American soil.

15. Resolved, That while it is highly gratifying to see such men as Hale, Sumner, Mann, Giddings, and Chase, earnestly endeavouring to resist the encroachments of the Slave Power, in their official position in Congress, and while we would accord to them full credit for all that they have done, it is saddening to reflect that they are able to occupy such a position only by swearing to support the Constitution of the United States—that 'covenant with death and agreement with hell,' by which no fugitive slave is allowed a shelter in any part of the country, which provides for a clear representation in the national legislature, that the political power of the slaveholders may be augmented in proportion to the number of their victims, whom they are thus directly stimulated to breed and multiply, and which keeps securely in their chains the entire slave population in the land.

16 Resolved, That a union with pirates for the protection of commerce—with idolators for the preservation of the Christian faith—is just as rational and praiseworthy as a union with slaveholders for the establishment of a free, republican government.

No. 6 against the Fugitive Slave Law was taken up and adopted without debate and with entire unanimity, as also was the 7th after brief remarks by Ira Gibson and Lewis Marshall.

No. 8, reaffirming the doctrine of "*No Union with Slaveholders*," was taken up, together with 14, 15 and 16, and sustained at length, and with convincing power, by Mr. Garrison, as containing the very gist of the Anti-Slavery movement. He maintained that our present Union was a mockery. It was not the Union of freemen, of equals, but of masters and subjects. While he rejoiced at the Speeches of Sumner, Hale, Giddings, and Horace Mann, they were in a false position, as members of a slaveholding Government and supporters of a slaveholding Constitution. He reviewed some of the positions of Mr. Sumner's speech in the Senate, showing that under our Government Slavery is and always has been *national*, and that an attempt to argue it out of the Constitution is like trying to disprove the existence of such men as Washington and Franklin. Slavery is not mentioned there by name, but the *thing* was introduced and protected; and the devil is no less a devil that he comes in the robes of an angel.

The Constitution as Mr. Sumner admits, sanctioned the "execrable piracy" of the African slave trade for twenty years, and gives a slave representation to the South. He knows that when it was adopted, Slavery existed in every State save Massachusetts, and that it has protected that system to this day in more than half the territory of the nation. Yet, Mr. Sumner tells us that Slavery is not national but sectional. Is it not absurd? Through the whole history of the government, the National power has protected Slavery as it has nothing else. There is no protection for freedom. The South proclaims "Death! instant death to every Abolitionist found in our borders," and the Government permits it. Nothing is left us to do, but by moral power to seek the overthrow of this government and its Constitution.

Ira Gibson asked if we might not *amend* the Constitution and thus cast out the devil, instead of destroying it; and if we do not vote, how can we amend it?

Mr. Garrison said we will do this by showing the devil in it so clearly that all men shall shrink from it. But to vote under it, is a moral impossibility. Suppose the Constitution forbade us to acknowledge one true God. Would you swear to support it for the privilege of voting to amend it ten or twenty years hence? But it cannot be amended. An amendment requires a vote of three-fourths of the States. When it was formed, some of its most odious provisions were introduced against the wishes of the majority of the States by the persistence of South Carolina and Georgia. The Slaveholders now threaten to dissolve the Union, if we repeal the Fugitive Slave Law, or abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia. What hope then have we that all the free States and half the slave States can be brought to insist upon an amendment to strike all proslavery provisions from the Constitution? Northern men say, The Union first, Freedom second. The Slaveholders say, Slavery first and the Union second, and so long as the North consents to the Union, Slavery will be first.

C. M. Burleigh thought it desirable to decide whether we should have an afternoon session, and the hour of final adjournment, and for this purpose he moved that we finally adjourn at 2 o'clock. This proposition, after a brief discussion by C. Darlington, J. M. McKim, M. B Linton and others, was negatived, and an afternoon session agreed to.

The 8th, 13th, 14th, 15th, and 16th resolutions, all relating to similar topics, were adopted together, and the 9th in condemnation of the Colonisation Society, was taken up. It was eloquently sustained by Robert Purvis, who exposed the wickedness and hypocrisy of that Society, and gave expression to the abhorrence felt for it by the free coloured people and their real friends.

It was animated by hatred toward the coloured people and was fraught with the worst evils to the race, and he had no charity for men who would support it under pretensions of benevolence to the people of colour. To this false and malignant institution, said Mr. P., our Legislature burdened with debt and almost bankrupt as the State is, has made an appropriation of $2,000. For this, our property is to be taxed and our money taken. It is time that we should treat the supporters of that Society as the enemies of the coloured race.

Thomas Whitson stated that we had still nearly $300 to raise, and we must do it here. He asked the friends to pledge the sums they would raise in their several neighbourhoods towards the sum. A considerable amount was pledged in this way when the Society took recess until 2 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The President took the chair, and the resolution on Colonisation coming up, Wm. H. Topp of Albany spoke ably and earnestly in its support, proving the Colonisation Society from its own professions and actions, and the character of its supporters, to be actuated by a cowardly and cruel jealousy toward the free coloured people, and a determination to get rid of them that the slaves may be held more securely. He claimed for the coloured men the right to decide for themselves, without dictation, where should be their home, and what portion of God's free air they would breathe. He only claimed for the coloured people their rights, and the removal of disabilities and then if they could not rise socially it would be their own fault. They tell us, said Mr. T., to look to Africa for our home. What do I know of Africa? I am part Indian and part German. My grandfather came from Germany. We are so mixed up that we don't know where we sprung from nor of what race we are. Why do they not attempt to colonise me to Germany, or the Western forests if I am to go to the land of my fathers? They tell us we may have a free government, and be Presidents, Governors, Legislators and Judges in Liberia. What do we care to [illegible] citizen, and shall contend on my native soil for the rights of an American citizen. This claim should every coloured man make and resolve to sustain it.

Mr. Garrison followed, in a clear, logical and convincing argument, tracing that Society from its origin among Slaveholders and haters of the free people of colour, through its whole thirty five years of fraud and bold-faced hypocrisy, and giving incontestible evidence in its public acts, the sentiments of its organ, and the character and speeches of its chosen orators and officers, that its spirit has ever been that of jealousy, prejudice and hatred to the persecuted and disfranchised coloured people. In reading these he was forced to exclaim, "Oh full of all subtlety and mischief, thou child of the Devil; thou enemy of all righteousness; when wilt thou cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord."

He denounced prejudice against colour, as unchristian, unnatural, vulgar and inhuman, showing it to be a legitimate offshoot of Slavery, and that more than by anything else besides Slavery, this wicked prejudice is fostered by the Colonisation Society

In conclusion, Mr. Garrison spoke a brief and impressive farewell to the Society and audience; expressing the great pleasure he had experienced in the meeting and intercourse with its members, and exhorting us all to faith and courage, brotherly harmony and charity, and a perseverance which will never faint or weary while life lasts.

Mr. Garrison was responded to by the hearty applause of the assembly, and as he retired, we believe many a heart gave him its silent blessing and God speed in his lifes great mission.

Robert Douglass sung "The Indian Hunter" and followed with remarks mainly showing the injustice of this country toward Hayti, when the resolution was unanimously adopted.

The 11th and 12th resolutions were passed without dissent, and after some remarks in its support by Mrs. Mott, the 13th, upon Free Produce was adopted.

Abby Kimber spoke in behalf of the Fair, urging its advantages, pecuniarily, socially and morally to our cause, and the importance of labour and contributions for it, in every region where any sympathy was felt for its object. After further remarks of the same tendency by Lucy Stone, Rebecca Plumly and Mrs Mott, the Society adjourned *sine die*, and its members separated evidently refreshed, animated and strengthened by their communion, for the work to which they returned.

C. M. BURLEIGH, *Secretary*.

WILLIAM AND ELLEN CRAFT.—A considerable time has elapsed since the Anti-Slavery public have had any account of these interesting fugitives, so celebrated for their double escape—first, from the cruelty of Southern slaveholders in the United States; and next from the oppression of the United States Government; which did its best to return them to perpetual bondage, by putting the Fugitive Slave Law in operation against them.

By the efforts of some who have taken a lively interest in them personally, and who also feel that they have a strong claim upon the sympathy and generosity of the country whose hospitality they have sought, for the temporary relief of their physical wants, and for the supplies of that mental light for which they have so long yearned, Mr. and Mrs. Craft have now entered upon a second year of instruction at the Industrial School at Ockham, near Ripley, Surrey. During the first year of their residence there they have been unremitting in their studies, and have made great proficiency in reading, writing, arithmetic, and in various branches of useful knowledge. These schools have the benefit of Government inspection, and are under the control of the Misses Lushington, of Ockham Park, daughters of Dr. Lushington—a name well known among the supporters of the Anti-Slavery Cause in England during its early history.

Arrangements have been considerately made, so that Mr. and Mrs. Craft receive their lessons in the way most agreeable to their feelings. They are now able to study and reflect upon the contents of that Sacred Record, which, for the greater portion of their lives, the American slaveholder rendered to them a sealed book. In their personal relations with those around them, they have won the respect and regard of all with whom they have come into communication.

Upon their future course they have not decided; their present object is the acquisition of such an amount of valuable education, as shall qualify them for filling whatever sphere of usefulness Providence may open to them, whether in a retired walk of life, or in one more accordant with their wishes, where they may devote themselves to the benefit of that race with which their sympathies and eventful history are so intimately associated.

Any friends of Mr. and Mrs. Craft who are specially interested in knowing the arrangements that are now being made for affording them educational advantages, may be informed by addressing a line to N. E. under cover, to the publisher of the *Advocate*.—(*London*) *Anti-Slavery Advocate*.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York*.

††† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York*.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1852.

THE BLIND GUIDES.

A Sermon,

PREACHED BEFORE THE CENTRAL SOCIETY, AT LYNN, MASS.

Sunday Evening, October 31st, 1852.

BY SAMUEL JOHNSON.

"Can the blind lead the blind."—*Luke VI.*: 39.

IT is an old complaint of the philosophers, that while most people keep a tight hold upon their purses, there should be so few who do not give over their souls to the good pleasure of others. Human nature fails to outgrow the disease; and here, in the modern republic, where our talk is of private responsibilities and private rights, it is as prevalent as ever. There is abundance of sagacity and prudent reserve when business interests are in view. What has bewitched these practical qualities, that they should give us the slip at the very moment when we need them the most! Where are they when we are taking moral impressions and choosing moral guides? It is startling to think how sharpsighted one may be in his commercial relations, and how complacent and secure he may feel in consequence, while his spiritual nature has scarcely the rudimentary eyes of the mole. He may safely defy the whole business world to cheat him at a bargain; and yet he is so blind that he cannot distinguish a Principle from a Compromise, nor protect the weak sides of his character from the flatterers and the sophists, till it has come to be too late, and they have dragged him down after them into the ditch.

We can hardly expect the blind to be very sagacious in the choice of guides. The complaint we make is, that a man of practical skill and prudence should *be* blind—blind in precisely the direction in which blindness is positive ruin; that he should overlook the simplest precautions in protecting his conscience, in a way which would mortify him beyond measure, if instead of the conscience it were the pocket he had to guard; that he should think no inspection of his neighbour's honesty and solvency too cautious, when the question is one of money, and yet allow some chance association or contagious excitement to throw his moral and spiritual destiny into worthless hands.

It is a comfortable belief, doubtless, that we are living in a sinless Eden, where only the voices of God and the angels are audible; that no one can possibly forget nor mistake the Eternal Laws; that all the vague impulses and first impressions, and passionate admirations, may safely be trusted; and your shrewd man of business will stake his soul upon this comfortable belief. But would he stake one dollar out of his pocket upon it? Oh, no! The dollar shall be guarded, and the soul take its chance. Our moral sight is dull enough at best. But we will draw over our eyes the films of a lazy indifference, and so be stone-blind.

Friends, it is worth while to ask ourselves what sort of guidance we are following, and in what *way* we follow it. Sooner than accept moral or spiritual bondage of any sort, it were better that we fell back upon the opposite extreme of an inaccessible pride, like that of the Eastern Emperor, who sternly rejected the rich gift of a neighbouring prince, saying that "neither he nor his predecessors had been wont to take; that it was their office to give." To the perils of that frail and easy virtue which keeps no guard over the freedom and clearness of the moral sense, all other perils are as the summer shower to the hurricane. The danger is the more insidious, because it usually begins far back in a safeguards is an old and settled habit before it begins to be a sin. The first step to vice of any sort is seldom a deliberate choice. A strong attraction surprises itself, and simply because the moral safeguard has not been placed at its proper post, the character yields passively in the direction proposed. As the habit goes on gaining strength by indulgence, of course anything like real choice becomes less and less practical, and when, at last, the conscience begins to see the sin, there is not felt enough interest in right principles to rouse it into protest. Here is the worst part of the prevailing indifference to proper moral guidance, that it has resulted in the prevailing inability to make any choice whatever in that respect.

In what sense can the young man be said to choose his guide who, in sauntering about the penny-paper shops or railroad stations, is attracted by the title of one of those pestilential cheap novels which flood the country with their corruption, and gets his first impressions of sensuality from the cunning turn of its sentences, and the perhaps unexpressed aim of its plot? While the poison is working subtly in his blood, and a feverish thirst for its pleasures is perpetually leading him back to those full springs, flowing up from the black fetid pools of the lowest pit, is it a deliberate choice that is steadily urging him on through from impurity in thought to iniquity in deed?

Or take a case of another kind. In what sense can one be said to choose his moral and religious guides who has listened from his childhood, in the same church, to preachers of the current gospel of Despair—to men whose arrogance lays claim to finality in doctrine, and hurl its anathemas against good and true men of opposite belief, and whose spurious conservatism ignores progress and flouts at philanthropy as old as the morning stars? It would scarcely be charitable to think that many rational beings would deliberately choose such guides. The fact is, there is very little choice in the matter; there is very little besides ecclesiastical inertia, and habitual respect for certain pulpits and pews, as well as for set formulas, ritual and dogmatic, whose virtue consists mainly in their familiarity and punctual recurrence. It is very noticeable how slight a matter of custom, association, hereditary property, or the like, holds multitudes of men and women to the support of religious teachings from which it is hard to believe they can get either comfort or light.

By what manner of choice is it that so many take their moral judgments ready-made, from the rich man, or the shrewd man, or the sneering skeptical man, or the opinionated man, or the sophistical man? This imitation comes, as the old writer hath it, "by contagion, not by discretion." It does the petty oracle as little honour as it does his votary, for there is no calm and free election about it. A sort of sleepy gravitation it is—a dull and lazy drawing towards such authorities as are nearest, and know how to work upon those passions and interests which happen for the time to be uppermost. There is a cunning play of hands over a passive subject; and then, the deathly trance, the soulless mimicry, the ghastly reflex of a foreign will.

And so, more truly so, in Politics. You can offer a man no insult that he will resent more than the charge that he does not choose his own leaders. Yet it is as plain as fact can make it, and every politician can see it in all parties but his own, that the leaders choose, instead of being chosen. They form the party plots; they make themselves essential to the interests of one man by flattering his conceit with office or praise, and adroitly manage the prejudices of another. They have chosen their followers as theologians have imagined Divine Predestination choosing its reprobates; shaping their ways to sure destruction, while they at their ease were fancying Heaven just at hand. If it is a farce, it is certainly a mournful one, the multitude of citizens duped and cajoled on from folly to folly, and apostacy to apostacy, by demagogue editors and stump-speakers, all the while announcing these with a democratic self-complacency, as their organs, their representatives, their servants! What unscrupulous manœuvre, what outrage upon private reputation, what infernal barbarity will not the partisan accept and encourage on the authority of his "Organ" that it is needful for the success of his party? And what sophistry is too dishonest and too barefaced to look like holiness itself when the same authority stamps it as fair and sound? To be sure, the Organ is owned and controlled by the party and the body of subscribers, and he is an integral portion of both. But such integral portions as he—and it does little credit to his wits that he is so slow to apprehend the fact—have little to do with the great machinery of means and ends, with the platforms and the candidates, and the measures; just thus much and no more—to shout for them when they are got ready, and follow them, right or wrong. I can find no better illustration of this folly of the partisan in supposing that he chooses his own leaders than that of the wealthy Roman, of whom it was said that he kept literary men to prompt him, now with a sentence from this and now from that author, that he might get the name of being learned, and who "really fancied that all this wisdom was his own, because it was in the heads of those who lived on his bounty."

But it is worse than folly. It is too fatal.—Covered up as all this Indifference, and Stupidity, and Inertness, and Moral Cowardice, is, under the name of Political Necessity, commended to feeble consciences by old attachments and business interests, coming on as it does, slowly and insidiously, it seems to the partisan to bear no relation whatever to the duties and destinies of the Soul. But if there be any possibility of a moment's serious reflection, let him ask himself, without delay, if such utter abandonment to the manifest compromises and apostacies of political life is not paralyzing his spiritual organs, the very nerves and senses of his immortal part! O, it is too perilous, this strange self-desertion and self-abuse, in the very opening of our Everlasting Journey, for words to tell!

It is to the peculiar nature of those political perils that I now ask your earnest attention. What, after all, is the moral guide to which the majority of this people pay political homage? There is a Sovereign Power to which the Religious Instincts, and Liberty, and Honesty, and Consistency, and Patriotism, and Humanity, are all sacrificed, as so much sheer prejudice and blank abstraction, whenever it says the word. What is that Power? What is the Arch-Enemy, that steals into every home, to slay the living souls of husband and wife and little ones, at the very hearthstone? What is it that must be warned off from you, and from every heart and mind that is dear to you, with a two-edged sword of flame? There are many Idols against which good men will warn you, and on which they will lay the heavy charges of our national sins. They will cry out against Idolatry of Official Power, of Intellect without Virtue, of the Rostrum, of the Political Journal, of the Church. And with some reason. But there is another Idolatry, in comparison with which these are of small account. It is the Idolatry of *Party Success*. Before this Idol all the others fall and are broken. It is worshipped sometimes from one motive, sometimes from another motive; but its throne is created over the prostrate consciences and hearts of all its worshippers. Against this I warn you. Our great American Idol is not the Church, by any means. The Church, or what passes for the Church, is, in the main, the Puppet of Party, and does the Party work. Party puts the preachers into the pulpits and turns them out. Time-serving Doctors of Divinity have their lesson to learn, and Party sets it. They are to stand in the pulpits as embodiments of the ruling party in the Pews, and by force of that position to control the minorities, and bring the prestige of Religion—yes, that is the plain fact—to serve as Party Capital. I do not wish to overstate the matter. I would far rather fall short of the shameful truth than go beyond it. If any man can find satisfaction in telling how the old and beautiful sanctities of the Church are dishonoured in these days, and the prestige of that free Gospel which came down from Heaven to rebuke princes, and put the pride and wrath of man under its feet, let out for wages to serve as Party Capital, he must be of other make than mine. What I must say, I will say briefly, and leave you to comment. Do not let us talk so much of the danger of idolising the Church. As soon might we fear the timid [illegible] The utmost the Church can do for evil is to mumble the burden of a Party war song, intelligibly enough, even if the lips are shut, to give the requisite religious sanction, and bring up the over-scrupulous laggards to the front. The utmost they can do is to profess that they love not the company of those stiff prophetic necks that still stand upright, and to rid themselves of it if they may. The attitude of the Pulpit, as a whole, in this country is too humiliating for anything like Idolatry. Fear not the power of the Pulpit. Fear the power of the Master who has bound the Pulpit.

The attitude of the Theological Press, as a whole, is quite as ineroic, and the idea of idolising a thing so obsequious and servile, quite as absurd. With one or two honourable exceptions, it holds the public attention by the tenure of a Party Puppet—that is, it either echoes the programme of some particular party, right or wrong, or it trims its tongue so as to satisfy the demands of all parties. Let me give you a specimen. Many of you have been wont to look to the *Unitarian* press for a pronounced and manly attitude on the side of Liberty. See how the *Christian Register*, the organ of that denomination, defines its present position to its Whig and Democratic subscribers.* After appealing to all true patriots and Christians to "stand by their principles and by the men who are the ablest and truest representatives of them, through all obloquy and defeat," it proceeds to apply the generous and noble sentiment in this wise: "We have nothing to say of the particular National Election which is now at hand, though our remarks are suggested by it (!) we have made up our mind to cast our vote *this time* for one of the three (two?) prominent candidates, but we shall do so with great reluctance, and with an indignant though silent protest against some of the resolutions passed by the Convention which nominated the man for whom our vote is to be given. The Fugitive Slave Law we can, under no circumstances recognise as an irrepealable law, &c." An indignant protest against the political doctrines of the man for whom *we intend to vote*, because he is the ablest and truest *representative of our principles*! And whether he be Whig or Democrat we do not venture to say, only we will vote for him *this time*, and with an indignant, *though silent*, protest! Is this the diet they put grown men and women upon?

But there is no need to comment on the above quotation. It speaks for itself, and sufficiently illustrates what has been said of the position of the Ecclesiastical organs generally. It is rather an extreme case, but it shows the general bearing and direction of less aggravated ones. I repeat to you that the danger is not from idolising the Church. *The poor Church is in very low estate.* I do not mean the Church *real*, friends. No such fall for that Serene, eternally strong and triumphant, in the bosom of unchanging Truth and Power and Love, that Church abides, and the falling away of sects and forms from its law cannot harm it. Not the Church *real*, but the Church *nominal*—the Church accredited by the State. It is of this I am speaking. This it is that lies so low.

Neither is our great idol in this country the Political Journal. This, too, is the Puppet of Party. It is not editorial talent usually, nor editorial virtue, that sustains the newspaper. It is simply the *Party Conformity* of the editor. Party keeps him in his chair or turns him out of it, according as he will or will not be its Puppet. He can dupe and mystify the voters, doubtless, to almost any extent. But then he must have good party authority for what he says; and it is not he that says it, after all, but the party managers somewhere else. His party may have a sovereign contempt of his character, and yet it will sustain him so long as he proves a good tool of the managers.

But are the party managers and demagogues our idols? No more than the Church or the Journal. *They* are Puppets too. They are perfectly well understood to be simply the machinery for party success. The cheers at the caucus do not mean admiration of the orator. They mean success to the Party. Let him but turn his back on his old confederates for some conviction's sake, or let them but turn away from their old principles at the dictation of expediency, while he abides by those principles—and forthwith the cheers turn to hisses, and he for whose public services no praise was too high becomes too contemptible to be treated with common decency and respect. There is no idolatry for the person of the party leader. He can lead nobody astray on the strength of his own interests merely. He must prove a party expediency, or he may as well argue to the driving snow-storm. If he can prove the party-expediency, he shall have his way. But he shall not therefore get personal respect. That is another matter. Would the *New-York Tribune*, which has made so many Anti-Slavery professions, be suffered to appeal to slaveholders to vote for the Whig candidate for the Presidency *on the ground that his defeat would help the Anti-Slavery Cause*—would it be suffered to resort to any such manœuvre as this, without indignant rebuke from the best men in the party, if the editor were not supposed to be acting as the interests of the party required? It is not respect for the man, but idolatry of the party, that shuts their lips, and makes them cover the shame with their shameful connivance.

High Office and Position has always been more or less of an Idol. But that too is a Puppet with us. There is no denying, to be sure, that so soon as a man gets into office, or begins to wield the influence of a high position, he straightway becomes an oracle. Strip off the finery, and he may be a clown; it is no matter. He has got the office by mere juggling, undeserved patronage, bribery perhaps—it is no matter. The position makes a new man of him. But not because it *is* Position. Not at all—the opposite party will villify him all the more for his high station—but because it is *the* position which embodies the Party. Yesterday his opinion was of no particular consequence. Now, it will overbear that of a dozen wiser and better men. But this is only because it is the *Party* opinion, spoken through the official Puppet of the party. Do we think it would be so easy for the stump orators, every four years, to keep the people listening and responding in caucus, night after night, to their ridiculous clap-trap laudations of some Presidential candidate, who must be worked up, as a matter of course, into a great Statesman and a great Fighter—if it were not *the party* that is to get all the glory and reward, after all? It is very generally understood that in this pushing Democracy of ours, the best and fittest men are not at all likely to get into the position of candidates for high office. It is very generally understood that the surest way to preferment is a hardy conceit and a ready subservience. It is well enough understood that candidates are usually selected at National Conventions, not for the good things they have done in statesmanship, but for having done little or nothing of the kind, either for good or for evil; not for being men of personal capacity and resource, who will leave their mark upon the National character, but for being men who can be *chosen*, and men who can be made to sign the party platform, and do the party bidding. There is no lack of shrewd perception on these matters. It is not the man, but the Party, that these caucuses are cheering to the echo, as he will find very speedily, if he dare resist the party will.

There is a wide-spread and dangerous admiration of what passes current for Intellect; of mere energy of will and grasp of understanding, apart from all moral regards whatever. But though our political habits are not a little infected with this propensity, there is an Idolatry which overrules and sets it aside. There is something more potent with us than Intellect of any sort, either rightly or wrongly used, either the intellect of mere practical talent, or the intellect of moral and religious genius. The breath of Party will sweep a political field of both, at its pleasure. The grave has just closed over the mortal remains of a man whom the People have been wont to eulogize as a miracle of Intellect; whose talents have been from first to last the crowning boast of the party to which he belonged. I do not allude to him now either to praise or to blame. For good or for evil there is little more that he can be made to do, by any words of ours. I have spoken, freely and fully, my opinion of his character and conduct, while he lived, and now I am content to be silent. But the close of his career is an impressive confirmation of what has just been said; and I ask you to consider with what a base unconcern that much lauded Intellect was deserted when it stood in the way of party triumph. Will this eager mockery of bells, cannons and crape serve to hide the open secret that what is now so complimented with the cheap courtesy of outward parade, was cast down in dishonour and thrust aside without scruple at the dictation of party availability? No, friends, whatever perils we may be encountering from the worship of mere personal Talent, there is an Idol a hundred fold more potent; and it is time we looked to this, with at least as much concern as to the doings of its dupes. Before this, Calhoun, Clay, Webster, go down, and are, practically, well-nigh forgotten before the grass grows once over their graves—forgotten with the last echoes of the cannon, the last appeals of the funeral eulogy, the last tones of the tolling bells—forgotten in new men, new conflicts, new issues, new sophistries and plots. As it stands towering above the great men and the little men, and leaders and led go down the depths of its gigantic shadow into the pit at its feet, it seems as if no power could break that fearful spell it is swaying so far, so wide, over conscience and will. Here, friends, is the Giant that would have the souls of your children. Atheism and Barbarism are written in the blackness of his scornful brow. He will have unqualified, unconditional allegiance; for he claims to stand instead of Religion, and Justice, and Philanthropy, and to hold the keys of Heaven and Hell

And what, at this moment, is the controlling element in his nature? What directs his policy, and dictates his Law? You know the answer. The slave system of the South; that blasting Falsehood and world-wide shame of the Nation. And what stands behind that and gives it efficiency at North and South? What but the Mammon of Selfishness—a Shadow only, whose Reality is in our Hearts and Wills? We, the people, have set up the Shadow to be our God, and forgotten that it is we who make it, and we who can destroy.

Shadow or substance, this is the guide we are to choose or to reject. If we do not choose at all, but inertly and carelessly follow blind attractions, then are we lost. As one who sits beside his night-fire in the forest, while the beasts go prowling round waiting till he shall fall asleep, and the fire die out, even so must *we* be watching, each and all. The Idol has his agents and ministers lurking round you, and their eyes are never turned from yours—the cunning, intriguing men, the unscrupulous men, the ambitious men, the party plotters and the party drillers. There is something in you that will serve the purposes of such men—they will use you for these purposes, and then throw you away in contempt, to grovel in the shame and wretchedness they are preparing for themselves. Are not your souls worth being kept from the wolves and vultures? If you are to have guides, let them be such as will not spoil you of honour and truth, to plead *their* mean ambition. "Accept no person against thy soul, neither let reverence for any man cause thee to fall." The blind guides have no power over you, but what they borrow from the great Idol. Renounce Him, and you are secure. When we shall stand naked and defenceless before the Retributions of the Eternal Laws, when no party demagogues nor cunning manœuvres of Expediency will avail one jot to help us out of their hands, when the question will be—"what hast thou done with thy brothers, with God's little ones?"—when Conscience can no longer be sneered off, nor the Higher Law be flouted at for fanaticism and insanity, but both shall stand over us and judge our deeds—oh then, miserable indeed will it be for us, if we can only plead that we have *saved our party*, by bowing down to Slavery and Mammon, the Fiends that fatten upon human souls!

Friends, let us look now at a direct and practical matter.

To such of you as are about to vote in the coming Election, I must say a word in conclusion upon that subject. I am not standing here, as you well know, to plead the cause of any party. I am neither a Whig nor a Democrat, nor a Free Soiler even. I am, and have always been, an Abolitionist. I wage moral warfare against a Slaveholding *Constitution* as well as against a Fugitive Slave Law and a Spirit of Slavery Extension. If I cannot vote without putting my name, personally or by proxy, to a document, some of whose provisions my soul abhors, then I will be content with moral effort, and the incessant protest of the lip and the life; well knowing that these are the mightiest and deepest energies after all. If others can take the meaning of those provisions differently, then I for one will not quarrel with their sincere *political* labours for the same end with my *moral* labours. I confess to a strong sympathy with the general aim of the Free Soil party, and have no hesitation in saying that but for my convictions with respect to the Constitution, I should sometimes sustain it with my vote. Its present National platform I regard as decidedly the best system of measures, on the whole, which any political party has proposed within the century. With its state policy of Coalition I have no sympathy whatever; and I believe it to be repugnant to the instincts of its best and wisest men. I can see no consistency in putting into office, with one hand, a man whose principles I do not approve, in order to put into office with the other hand a man whose principles I do approve. But of State politics I do not intend to speak now. The National Free Soil Party is not responsible for the intrigues of its Massachusetts members.

Yet I repeat it; I do not undertake to advise any man to vote for one party or for another party. This I say. Your vote, if it means anything—and something it does mean, for it is a solemn trust you are discharging for the weal or woe of every one of your fellow citizens, and for the honour or shame of your own soul—your vote means your moral principles, your moral convictions. It implies and affirms that you *have* such principles, such convictions. Your vote for a candidate means your approbation of *his* principles, and those of the party which nominates him, principles which are laid down in the platform, he stands on, and is pledged to maintain. This is unquestionable. Do you realize how shocking to all morality and reason is the novel sophism of the New York *Tribune* and *Christian Register*, that you have the right to put a man into office by your vote, at the same time that you repudiate the principles he is pledged to carry out when he gets there? What else can such a vote be but a direct and positive falsehood in the face of God and man? I do not say that every man who casts such a vote deliberately affirms a lie. I know the power of party delirium. I know the easy credulity of a party conscience. But for all that, in the eye of Christian morality, the act has no Truth, nor Honour, nor Manliness, about it. I trust you are proof against the temptations of these scandalous ethics of moral cowardice and party desperation. I trust that to not one of you his party is worth that sacrifice of Truth, that sin against all sober conviction, that apostacy involving likewise other apostacies to come, in a series that cannot be fathomed. It seems to be fashionable to regard party allegiance as a fixed necessity, which you must take for granted as a starting point for all political action, no more to be put aside or questioned than the facts of the material universe. I trust you are ready to take nothing for granted which is wrong; to start from no point but an honest faith in God and the Right; to put aside party allegiance as you would any other sin, as soon as you are convinced that a sin it is.

Look seriously then at the position in which you will have placed yourself, if you vote for the candidate of either of the two great parties. Both of them have openly pledged themselves to the support of the Fugitive Slave Law, and the one to discountennance, the other to resist

CIRCULAR OF GERRIT SMITH.

It is not probable that there was a single voter in Mr. Smith's Congressional District ignorant of his principles, and it is fair to conclude that, having given him a majority of votes, those principles were, on the whole, approved of. If this be true, it is an encouraging fact that so large a number of the people choose, notwithstanding their submission to party dictation in the choice of a President, that their immediate representative should be one universally known for his deep abhorrence of the system of Southern Slavery, and whose whole life is a pledge that his utmost exertions would be used in Congress for its utter extermination. That Mr. Smith should renew this pledge in words, at this time, was hardly necessary, but that he should do so is quite characteristic of the man who is not willing that any possibility, however remote, of any misunderstanding of his position should exist. He has accordingly, in the following Circular, stated anew to his constituents his political faith in relation to Slavery and other momentous subjects:

To the Voters of the Counties of Oswego and Madison.

You nominated me for a seat in Congress, notwithstanding I besought you not to do so. In vain was my resistance to your persevering and unrelenting purpose.

I had reached old age. I had never held office. Nothing was more foreign to my expectations, and nothing was more foreign to my wishes than the holding of office. My multiplied and extensive affairs gave me full employment. My habits, all formed in private life, all shrank from public life. My plans of usefulness and happiness could be carried out only in the seclusion in which my years had been spent.

My nomination, as I supposed it would, resulted in my election—and that, too, by a very large majority. And, now, I wish that I could resign the office which your partiality has accorded to me. But I must not—I cannot. To resign it would be a most ungrateful and offensive requital of the rare generosity which broke through your strong attachments to party, and bestowed your votes on one, the peculiarities of whose political creed leave him without a party. Very rare, indeed, is the generosity, which was not to be repelled by a political creed, among the peculiarities of which are

1st. That it acknowledges no law, and knows no law, for Slavery; that not only is Slavery not in the Federal Constitution, but that by no possibility could it be brought either into the Federal or into a State Constitution.

2d. That the right to the soil is as natural, absolute, and equal, as the right to the light and the air.

3d. That political rights are not conventional, but natural—inhering in all persons, the black as well as the white, the female as well as the male.

4th. That the doctrine of Free Trade is the necessary outgrowth of the doctrine of the human brotherhood; and that to impose restrictions on commerce is to build up unnatural and sinful barriers across that brotherhood.

5th. That national wars are as brutal, barbarous, and unnecessary, as are the violence and bloodshed to which misguided and frenzied individuals are prompted; and that our country should, by her own Heaven-trusting and beautiful example, hasten the day when the nations of the earth "shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

6th. That the province of Government is but to protect—to protect persons and property; and that the building of railroads and canals and the care of schools and churches fall entirely outside of its limits, and exclusively within the range of "the voluntary principle." Narrow, however, as are these limits, every duty within them is to be promptly, faithfully, fully performed; as well, for instance, the duty on the part of the Federal Government to put an end to the dramshop manufacture of paupers and madmen in the City of Washington, as the duty on the part of the State Government to put an end to it in the State.

7th. That, as far as practicable, every officer, from the highest to the lowest, including especially the President and Postmaster, should be elected directly by the people.

I need not extend any further the enumeration of the features of my peculiar political creed; and I need not enlarge upon the reason, which I gave, why I must not, and cannot, resign the office which you have conferred upon me. I will only add, that I accept it; that my whole heart is moved to gratitude by your bestowment of it; and that, God helping me, I will so discharge its duties as neither to dishonour myself nor you.

Peterboro, Nov. 5, 1852. GERRIT SMITH.

THE SLAVE CASE.

The decision of Judge Paine, in the case of the eight slaves brought into this city by Jonathan Lemmon and his wife from Virginia, was given on Saturday, and was in accordance with the principles of law and the dictates of justice. No apprehension was felt that it would be otherwise, though, if we may take the *Journal of Commerce*, the *Herald*, and the *Day Book* as the representatives of any portion of this community, there are persons in it, who would be glad to see New York a Slave State. We fear their number is not a small one, but are not quite ready to believe that that man yet sits on the judicial bench who will, in obedience to a popular clamour, and without any show of reason, outrage all that have hitherto been held sacred as the first principles of common law, and the simplest rights of a citizen.

On Tuesday afternoon of last week the case came on for a final hearing, and counsel were heard on both sides as was stated in our last number. Judge Paine announced that his decision would be given on Saturday in writing, and accordingly on that day it was given as follows:

SUPERIOR COURT.

The People, &c., ex. rel. Louis Napoleon agt. *Jonathan Lemmon, respondent.*

The court was opened at twelve o'clock to-day, when the following decision was rendered by

Paine J.—This case comes before me upon a writ of *habeas corpus*, issued to the respondent, requiring him to have the bodies of eight coloured persons, lately taken from the steamer City of Richmond, and now confined in a house in this city, before me, together with the cause of their imprisonment and detention.

The respondent has returned to this writ, that said eight coloured persons are the property of his wife, Juliet Lemmon, who has been their owner for several years past, she being a resident of Virginia, a slaveholding State, and by the constitution and laws of that State they have been, and still are, bound to her service as slaves; that she is now, with her said slaves or property, *in transitu* from Virginia to Texas, another slaveholding State, and by the constitution and laws of which she would be entitled to said slaves and to their service; that she never had any intention of bringing, and did not bring them into this State to remain or reside, but was passing through the harbour of New York, on her way from Virginia to Texas, when she was compelled by necessity to touch or land, without intending to remain longer than was necessary. And she insists that said persons are not free, but are slaves as aforesaid, and that she is entitled to their possession and custody.

To this return the relator has put in a general demurrer.

I certainly supposed, when this case was first presented to me, that, as there could be no dispute about the facts, there would be no delay or difficulty in disposing of it. But, upon the argument, the counsel for the respondent cited several cases which satisfied me that this case could not be decided until those had been carefully examined.

The principle which those cases tend more or less forcibly to sustain, is, that if the owner of the slaves is merely passing from home with them, through a free State, into another slave State, without any intention of remaining, the slaves, while in such free State, will not be allowed to assert their freedom. As that is precisely the state of facts constituting this case, it becomes necessary to inquire whether the doctrine of those cases can be maintained upon general principles, and whether the law of this State does not differ from the laws of those States where the decisions were made.

I shall first consider whether those cases can be sustained upon general principles.

The first case of the kind which occurred was that of Sewall's slaves, which was decided in Indiana, in 1829, by Judge Morris, and will be found reported in 3 Am. Jurist, 404. The return to the *habeas corpus* stated that Sewall resided in Virginia, and owned and held the slaves under the laws of that State; that he was emigrating with them to Missouri, and on his way was passing through Indiana, when he was served with the *habeas corpus*.

It, however, appeared on the hearing that Sewall was not going to Missouri to reside, but to Illinois, a State whose laws do not allow of Slavery. The Judge, for this reason, discharged the slaves. This case, therefore, is not in point, and would be entirely irrelevant to the present, were it not for a portion of the Judge's opinion, which was not called for by the case before him, but applies directly to the case now before me.

"By the law," he says, "of nature and of nations (Vattel 160), and the necessary and legal consequences resulting from the civil and political relations subsisting between the citizens as well as the States of this Federal Republic, I have no doubt but the citizen of a slave State has a right to pass, upon business or pleasure, through any of the States, attended by his slaves or servants; and while he retains the character and rights of a citizen of a slave State, his right to retain his slaves would be unquestioned. An escape from the attendance upon the person of his master, while on a journey through a free State, should be considered as an escape from the State where the master had a right of citizenship, and by the laws of which the service of the slave was due. The emigrant from one State to another might be considered prospectively as the citizen or resident of the State to which he was removing; and should be protected in the enjoyment of those rights he acquired in the State from which he emigrated, and which are recognised and protected by the laws of the State to which he is going. But this right, I conceive, cannot be derived from any provision of positive law."

The next case relied upon is *Willard* agt. *The People* (4 Scammon's Rep. 461), and which was decided in the State of Illinois, in 1843. It was an indictment for secreting a woman of colour owing service to a resident of Lousiana. The indictment was under the 149th section of the Criminal Code, which provides that

"If any person shall harbour or secrete any negro, mulatto, or person of colour, the same being a slave or a servant owing service or labour to any other persons; whether they reside in this State or in any other State, or territory, or district, within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States, or shall in anywise hinder or prevent the lawful owner or owners of such slaves or servants from re-taking them in a lawful manner, every such person so offending shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanour, and fined not exceeding five hundred dollars, or imprisoned not exceeding six months."

It appeared that the woman of colour was a slave, owned by a resident of Louisiana, and that, while passing with her mistress from Kentucky to Louisiana through the State of Illinois, she made her escape in the latter State, and was secreted by the defendant.

There were several questions raised in the case which it is unnecessary now to notice. The indictment, which was demurred to, was sustained by the court. The main objection to it was that the section of the code under which it was found was a violation of the sixth article of the constitution of the State of Illinois, which declares that "Neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude shall hereafter be introduced into this State, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted."

The court, in answering this objection, say:

"The only question, therefore, is the right of transit with a slave; for if the slave upon entering our territory, although for a mere transit to another State, becomes free under the Constitution, then the defendant in error is not guilty of concealing such a person as is described in the law and in the indictment. The 149th section of the criminal code, for a violation of which the plaintiff is indicted, does most distinctly recognise the existence of the institution of Slavery in some of these United States, and whether the constitution and laws of this State have or have not provided adequate remedies to enforce within its jurisdiction that obligation of service, it has provided by this penal sanction, that none shall harbour or conceal a slave within this State, who owes such service out of it. Every State or Government may or may not, as it choses, recognise and enforce this law of comity. And to this extent this State has expressly done so.

"If we should, therefore, regard ourselves as a distinct and separate nation from our sister States, still, as by the law of nations (Vattel, B. 2., ch. 10, s. 132, 133, 134), the citizens of one government have a right of passage through the territory of another peaceably, for business or pleasure, and that, too without the latter's acquiring any right over the person or property (Vattel, B. 2, s. 107, 109), we could not deny them this international right without a violation of our duty. Much less could we disregard their constitutional right, as citizens of one of the States, to all the rights, immunities and privileges of citizens of the several States. It would be startling, indeed, if we should deny our neighbours and kindred that common right of free and safe passage which foreign nations would hardly dare deny. The recognition of this right is no violation of our constitution. It is not an introduction of Slavery into this State, as was contended in argument, and the slave does not become free by the constitution of Illinois by coming into the State for the mere purpose of passage through it."

Another case cited by the respondent's counsel was the *Commonwealth* agt. *Aves* (18 Pickering's Rep. 193). In this case the owner brought her slave with her from New Orleans to Boston, on a visit to her father, with whom she intended to spend five or six months, and then return with the slave to New Orleans. The slave being brought up on *habeas corpus*, the court ordered her discharge. The case was fully argued, and Chief Justice Shaw closes a very elaborate opinion with these words:

"Nor do we give any opinion upon the case, where an owner of a slave in one State is *bona fide* removing to another State where slavery is allowed, and, in so doing, necessarily passes through a free State, or where, by accident or necessity, he is compelled to touch or land therein, remaining no longer than necessary."

I have quoted large from the opinions in these cases, in order that it may be understood clearly what is presented by them as their governing principle. The respondent's counsel insists it is this: That by the law of nations, an owner of a slave may, either from necessity or in the absence of all intention to remain, pass with such slave through a state, where Slavery is not legalized, on his way from one slave State to another, and that during such transit through the free State the slave cannot assert his freedom.

I admit that this is the principle of these cases, and I now propose to consider it. Each case denies that the right of transit can be derived from the provision of the Consitution of the United States, respecting the fugitive slaves, and, where an opinion was expressed, places the right upon the law of nations.

Writers of the highest authority on the law of nations agree that strangers have a right to pass with their property through the territories of a nation (Vattel, B 2, ch. 9, ss 120 to 130; Pufendorf, B. 8, ch. 2, ss. 5 to 10). And this right, which exists by nature between States wholly foreign to each other, undoubtedly exists, at least as a natural right, between the States which compose our Union.

But we are to look further than this, and to see what the law of nations is, when the property which a stranger wishes to take with him is a slave.

The property which the writers on the law of nations speak of is merchandise or inanimate things, and by the law of nature these belong to their owner. But those writers nowhere speak of a right to pass through a foreign country with slaves as property. On the contrary, they all agree that by the law of nature alone no one can have a property in slaves. And they also hold that, even where Slavery is established by the local law, a man cannot have that full and absolute property in a person which he may have in an inanimate thing (Pufendorf, B. 6, ch 3, s. 7). It can scarcely, therefore, be said, that when writers on the law of nations maintain that strangers have a right to pass through a country with their merchandise or property, they thereby maintain their right to pass with their slaves.

But the property or merchandise spoken of by writers on the law of nations which the stranger may take with him, being mere inanimate things, can have no rights; and the rights of the owner are all that can be thought of. It is, therefore, necessary to look still further and to see what is the state of things, by the law of nature, as affecting the rights of the slave, when an owner finds himself, from necessity, with his slave in a country where Slavery is not legalized or is not upheld by law.

It is generally supposed that freedom of the soil from Slavery is the boast of the common law of England, and that a great truth was brought to light in Somerset's case. This is not so. Lord Mansfield was by no means, so far as the rest of the world is concerned, the pioneer of freedom. Whatever honour there may be in having first asserted that Slavery cannot exist by the law of nature, but only by force of local law, that honour among modern nations belongs to France, and among systems of jurisprudence to the civil law. The case of Somerset did not occur until the year 1772, and in 1738 a case arose in France in which it was held that a negro slave became free by being brought into France (13 Causes Celebres, 49).

But in truth the discovery that by nature all men are free belongs neither to England nor France, but is as old as ancient Rome; and the law of Rome repeatedly asserts that all men by nature are free, and that Slavery can subsist only by the laws of the State (Digests, B. 1, T. 1, s. 4, B. 1, T. 5, ss. 4, 5).

The writers on the law of nations uniformly maintain the same principal, viz., that by the law of nature all men are free, and that where Slavery is not established and upheld by the law of the State there can be no slaves (Grotius B. 2, ch. 22, s. 11, Hobbes De Cive B. 1, ch. 1, s. 3. Pufendorf (Barbeyrac) Droit de la Nature B. 3, ch. 2, ss. 1, 2, B. 6, ch. 3, s. 2).

The same writers also hold that by the law of nature one race of men is no more subject to be reduced to Slavery than other races (Pufendorf, B. 3, ch. 2, s. 5).

When we are considering a master and slave in a free State, where Slavery is not upheld by law, we must take into view all these principles of the law of nature, and see how they are respectively to be dealt with according to that law; for it will be remembered that the master can now claim nothing except by virtue of the law of nature. He claims under that law a right to pass through the country. That is awarded to him. But he claims, in addition, to take his slave with him; but upon what ground? That the slave is his property. By the same law, however, under which he himself claims, that cannot be; for the law of nature says that there can be no property in a slave.

We must look still further to see what is to be done with the claims of the slave. There being now no law but the law of nature, the slave must have all his rights under that, as well as the master; and it is just as much a slave's right under that to be free as it is the master's to pass through the country. It is very clear, therefore, that the slave has a right to his freedom, and that the master cannot have a right to take him with him.

As the cases cited by the respondent's counsel all vest the Master's right of transit exclusively upon the law of nations, and admit that he cannot have it under any other law, I have thus followed out that view, perhaps at unnecessary length, in order to see to what it would lead. In order to prevent any misapprehension as to the identity of the law of nature and the law of nations, I will close my observations upon this part of the case with a citation, upon that point, from Vattel (Preliminaries s. 6): "The law of nations is originally no more than the law of nature applied to nations."

I ought also to notice here that the respondent's counsel, upon the authority of the case in Illinois, insisted that this right of transit with slaves is strengthened by that clause in the constitution of the United States which declares that "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." The case in Indiana, on the other hand, says expressly that the right does not depend upon any positive law.

I think this remark must have found its way into the opinion of the judge who decided the Illinois case without due consideration. I have always understood that provision of the constitution to mean (at least so far as this case is concerned) that a citizen who was absent from his own State, and in some other State, was entitled while there to all the privileges of the citizens of that State. And I have never heard of any other or different meaning being given to it. It would be absurd to say, that while in the sister State, he is entitled to all the previleges secured to citizens by the laws of all the several States or even of his own State; for that would be to confound all territorial limits, and give to the States not only an entire community, but a perfect confusion of laws. If I am right in this view of the matter, the clause of the constitution relied upon cannot help the respondent; for if he is entitled while here to those previleges only which the citizens of this State possess, he cannot hold his slaves.

I must also here notice some other similar grounds insisted upon by the respondent's counsel.

He cites Vattel (B. 2, ch. 8, s. 81) to prove that the goods of an individual as regards other States are the goods of his State. I have already shown that by the law of nature, about which alone Vattel is always speaking, slaves are not goods; and I may add that what Vattel says in the passage to which he refers has no connexion with the right of transit through a foreign country. Besides, in the case from Illinois, referred to by respondent's counsel, the Court distinctly declare (Willard agt. People, 4 Scammon's Rep. 471) that they "cannot see the application to this case of the law of nations in relation to the domcil of the owner fixing the condition of and securing the right of property in this slave, and regarding the slave as a part of the wealth of Louisiana, and our obligation of comity to respect and enforce that right."

The respondent's counsel also refers to those provisions of the constitution of the United States which relate to fugitive slaves and to the regulation of commerce among the several States. With regard to the first of these provisions, which the counsel insists recognises and gives a property in slaves, it is sufficient to say, that although the supreme law of the land in respect to fugitive slaves, and as such entitled to unquestioning obedience from all, it is, so far as everything else is concerned, the same as if there were no such provision in the constitution. This has been so held in cases almost without number, and is held in each of the three cases cited by the respondent's counsel, and upon which I have before commented.

As for the provision of the constitution in relation to commerce among the States, it has been often held, that notwithstanding this provision, the States have the power impliedly reserved to them of passing all such laws as may be necessary for the preservation, within the State, of health, order and the well being of society, or laws which are usually called sanative and police regulations (Passenger cases 7 *Howard S. C. R*, 283. License cases 5 *Ib* 504. Blackbird Creek Marsh Company 2 *Peters* 250. New York agt, Miln 11 *Peters* 130. Brown agt. State of Maryland 12 *Wheat*. 419. Groves agt. Slaughter 15 *Peters* 511). Laws regulating or entirely abolishing Slavery, or forbidding the bringing of slaves into a State, belong to this class of laws, and a right to pass those laws is not effected by the constitution of the United States.

This view of the subject is taken by the three cases upon which the counsel mainly relies. And even if all this were not so, I apprehend that the constitution, having undertaken to regulate both external and internal commerce in slaves, by certain distinct and specific provisions (viz., those in relation to the importation of slaves from abroad, and the return of fugitive slaves), has thereby taken the element of Slavery out of these general provisions in relation to commerce, and having legislated separately upon the subject of Slavery to a very limited extent and there stopped, has thereby shown its intention to dispose separately and completely of that subject, so far as it was to be disposed of, and has not left to Congress any power over it under the general provisions relating to commerce. For under any other view of the subject, the provisions in relation to the importation of slaves and to fugitive slaves would be entirely superfluous.

If the constitution had intended to give Congress power over Slavery by the general provision in relation to commerce, that provision is, of itself, quite sufficient by its letter or terms, to enable Congress to do all that they are specially empowered to do by the clauses expressly relating to Slavery; and as an express power takes away a power which might otherwise be tacitly implied, I think it has clearly done so in this instance.

It remains for me to consider how far the local law of New York effects this case, and distinguishes it from the cases in Indiana and Illinois.

To go back, first, to the right of transit with slaves, as it is claimed to exist by the natural law. It appears to be settled in the law of nations, that a right to transit with property not only exists, but that where such right grows out of a necessity created by the *vis major*, it is a perfect right, and cannot be lawfully refused to a stranger (Vattel, B 2 ch. 9 s. 123. Ib Preliminaries, s. 17. Pufendorf, B. 3, ch. 3, s. 9). In this case it is insisted that the respondent came here with his slaves from necessity, the return having so stated, and the demurrer admitting that statement. It is perfectly true that the demurrer admits whatever is well pleaded in the return. But if the return intended to state a necessity created by the *vis major*, it has pleaded it badly, for it only alleges a necessity, without saying what kind of necessity; and, as it does not allege a necessity created by the *vis major*, the demurrer has not admitted any such necessity. Where the right of transit does not spring from the *vis major*, the same writers agree that it may be lawfully refused. Ib.

But, however this may be, it is well settled in this country, and so far as I know has not heretofore been disputed, that a State may rightly pass laws, if it chooses to do so, forbidding the entrance or bringing of slaves into its territory. This is so held even by each of the three cases upon which the respondent's counsel relies (Commonwealth agt Ayres, 18 Pick. R. 221. Willard agt. the People, 4 Scammons Rep., 471. Case of Sewall's Slaves, 3 Am. Jurist, 404).

The laws of the State of New York upon this subject appear to me to be entirely free from any uncertainty. In my opinion they not only do not uphold or legalize a property in slaves within the limits of the State, but they render it impossible that such property should exist within those limits, except in the single instance of fugitives from labour under the Constitution of the United States.

The Revised Statutes (vol. 1, 656, 1st Ed.), re-enacting the law of 1817, provide that "No person held as a slave shall be imported, introduced or brought into this State, on any pretence whatever, except in the cases hereinafter specified. Every such person shall be free. Every person held as a slave who hath been introduced or brought into this State contrary to the laws is force at the time shall be free" (S. 1).

The cases excepted by this section are provided for in the six succeeding sections. The second section excepts fugitives under the constitution of the United States; the third, fourth and fifth sections except certain slaves belonging to immigrants, who may continue to be held as apprentices; the seventh section provides that families coming here to reside temporarily may bring with them and take away their slaves; and the sixth section contains the following provision:

"Any person not being an inhabitant of this State, who shall be traveling to or from, or passing through this State, may bring with him any person lawfully held by him in Slavery, and may take such person with him from this State; but the person so held in Slavery shall not reside or continue in this State more than nine months; and if such residence be continued beyond that time, such person shall be free."

Such was and had always been the law of this State, down to the year 1841. The Legislature of that year passed an act amending the revised statutes, in the following words, viz: "The 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th sections of title 7, chapter 20, of the 1st part of the revised statutes are hereby repealed."

The 6th section of the Revised Statutes alone, and that contained an exception which would have saved the slaves of the respondent from the operation of the 1st section. The Legislature, by repealing that section and leaving the 1st in full force, have, as regards the rights of these people and of their master, made them absolutely free; and that not merely by the legal effect of the repealing statute, but by the clear and deliberate intention of the Legislature. It is impossible to make this more clear than it is by the mere language and evident objects of the two acts.

It was, however, insisted on the argument that the words "imported, introduced or brought into this State," in the 1st Section of the Revised Statutes, meant only "introduced or brought" for the purpose of remaining here. So they did undoubtedly when the Revised Statutes were passed, for an express exception followed in the 6th Section giving that meaning to the 1st. And when the legislature afterwards repealed the 6th Section, they entirely removed that meaning, leaving the first Section, and intending to leave it, to mean what its own explicit and an unreserved and unqualified language imports.

Not thinking myself called upon to treat this case as a casuist or legislator, I have endeavoured simply to discharge my duty as a Judge in interpreting and applying the laws as I find them. Did not the law seem so clear to me, I might feel greater regret, that I have been obliged to dispose so hastily of a case involving such important consequences.

My judgment is, that the eight coloured persons mentioned in the writ, be discharged.

The reading of the decision was followed by tumultuous applause among the coloured persons, of whom there were a large number present. When the applause with which the decision was received was suppressed by the officer of the court, Mr. Lepaugh the counsel for the claimants arose, and spoke as follows:

May it please the court, the important consequences of this decision no one can doubt. Since it is the decision of your honour, we, as law-abiding citizens, bow to it; and I do not rise now for any other purpose than to propose to the counsel on the other side, since your honour has no power to stay any proceeding, to give us the right of appeal to the general term of your own court, and since the remedy must be obtained through the Supreme Court (if they be willing to act fairly and properly in the case as they have intimated). I propose that these eight persons shall remain in such place as may be determined upon, until we can have the decision of your honour reviewed.

Mr. Culver. I don't know what kind of stipulation we can have about these persons. My own desire is to have it brought before the Supreme Court, and we intend to keep them in this State, and to throw no impediment in the way of an appeal.

Mr. Jay here remarked that he would not consent, if he had the power to keep them in the State for any such purpose.

A brief discussion here took place, elicited by a remark of Mr. Culver, in regard to the present impoverished condition of these coloured persons, who, he said, after toiling their whole lifetime, were now without the means of subsistence. The discussion was interrupted by Judge Paine, who said, that any farther remarks were unnecessary, as the case had been decided.

Mr. Lepaugh desired to know if the counsel on the other side would grant the claimants the privildge of consulting with his clients, as he was fully satisfied that when they were removed from the influences which surround them, that they would consent to go with their former owners.

Mr. Culver replied that he had no objection.

The argument ensued in relation to costs which the judge refused to grant to the counsel for the slaves. Mr. Jay subsequently remarked that he only asked for costs, for the purpose of adding the same to a sum to be raised for the benefit of the slaves. In answer to this and other similar remarks, the judge said.

"No one can feel more sensibly than the court for the unfortunate condition of these persons, and I must confess that the decision I have given distresses me very much, under the apprehension that they will not be very happy hereafter."

THE ADVANTAGES OF TRAVELLING.—That travelling has a tendency to enlighten the mind has long been an undisputed proposition, though the 'grand tour' is not yet come to be considered a necessary part of the education of the young American. We do not remember to have seen lately a more striking proof of the advantages of going abroad than that related by the London correspondent of the (N. Y.) *Independent* in the following paragraph. If Mr. Abbott Lawrence's notion of Equality and Fraternity has become so enlarged by a residence near the Court of St. James as this writer asserts, what may we not expect when Young America shall have been more abroad? Mr. Lawrence, it is to be hoped, will be as ready in Boston as in London to admit the claim of a respectable and educated coloured man to social recognition. We could send some scores to him far more worthy of it than the Liberian Governor.

The occasion referred to by the correspondent of the *Independent* in the following paragraph was a dinner at Mr. Peabody's the American Banker:,

"I was astonished and gratified to see Mr. Lawrence walk through the parlours arm in arm with President Roberts of Liberia, introducing him as a particular friend to 'My Lord Mayor,' Sir Charles, and other notables. What a change when the American Ambassador, the associates of lords at the Court of St. James, at home a merchant prince and leading citizen of Boston, does openly what other citizens of Boston have been mobbed for attempting—walks arm in arm with a respectable coloured man, just as if he were a man and a gentleman; does this too in face of the world, and in the presence of Southern gentlemen who no doubt have upon their plantations the sons and daughters of African chiefs and kings. It seemed a worthy close of his official career. It was as if he had said: My Lord Mayor, you perceive that I am entirely free from that prejudice against colour which is imputed to Americans. I take this method of avowing to you and to my countrymen, here in the face of the civilized world, that in my social intercourse and in my public relations I recognise no shades of skin. What a blessed prospect is before the coloured population of Boston! Who of them will be invited to grace the Ambassador's return? I commend the subject to the *Journal of Commerce*."

☞ THE FUNERAL OBSEQUIES OF MR. WEBSTER were celebrated, in this city, on Tuesday of this week, by a procession, and a Eulogy by James T. Brady, hitherto principally notorious for his unscrupulous and disgusting political diatribes in Tammany Hall. As usual on such occasions, many buildings were draped in black muslin, and adorned with inscriptions more or less appropriate. The most just and significant we have heard of was this, stretching across the front of Tammany Hall, opposite the point from which the procession commenced its march: THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY REVERES THE MEMORY OF THE GREAT AMERICAN STATESMAN WHO, ON THE SEVENTH OF MARCH, 1850, EXTINGUISHED THE WILMOT PROVISO.

HALE'S VOTE.—The official returns from all the Northern States have not yet been published, so that the vote for Mr. Hale has not yet, that we know of, been counted. It is calculated, however, that it will be about one half that given to Van Buren in '48. In this State it is supposed that it will be about thirty thousand. In New Jersey it was, as we see by the official return, only 344; in New Hampshire, 6,430; in Maine, all but a few towns being returned, 7,924; in Vermont, in 156 towns, 6,268; in Pennsylvania, 8,500.

Domestic Correspondence.

FROM OUR BOSTON CORRESPONDENT.

NO. CXIV.

THE ARGUMENT. — *The Correspondent discourseth wisely and willingly of sundry topics, such as Mr. Webster's Will, his Letters, his Literary Executors, also of the Corresponding Editor, of Hyenas, likewise of himself, and of divers other matters, whereof the Reader will be more fully informed when he hath read them, &c., &c., &c.*

BOSTON, Nov. 15, 1852.

THE Nine Days Wonder of Mr. Webster's death and funeral is hardly over yet. It may, possibly, be kept up for nine days more—though the interest, being to so large a degree entirely factitious, is fast dying out. It is very entertaining to hear eminent Whigs (Scott ones, of course), who have assisted at some of the very Meetings which have passed the most fulsome resolutions about Mr. Webster, talk about him among friends. The contrast between the unmitigated eulogy of their public action and the undisguised contempt and detestation of their private conversation, is as good as a farce. Those in Boston, too, have not been put in any better humour with him, or the political rag-tag-and-bob-tail that name his name, by their giving the plurality in the city to the Democrats, for the first time for this many a year, at the Presidential election. This they did by still voting for the dead Webster and the mythic Jenkins, and thus taking some thousand votes or so from General Scott. This was all the triumph the poor follows had. They have not affected a single Electoral Vote in the Nation. Scott, beaten as he is, has no fewer votes for all them. The Scott Whigs talked, in their wrath, as if they should leave it to the Webster men to elect the State ticket, the next week. But their courage oozed out at the palms of their hands, like Acres', and the party vote, at the State Election, was not materially damaged by their secessions.—Though the Temperance element prevent the election of some dozen of our half hundred Representatives.

The proceedings of Mr. Webster's friends, since his death, have afforded some entertainment as well as excited a little wrath among the lieges. You know Mr. Webster made a Will making certain provisions for his family, especially with regard to his Estate at Marshfield (and that at Franklin, I think), which he wished to entail after some fashion or other upon his heirs. Now the Committee on the Memorial to Mr. Webster, in their Prospectus, give the public to understand that he did not leave property enough to meet the arrangements of this testament, and so they propose, by way of inducement to subscriptions, that any surplus over and above what is necessary for his Monument SHALL BE APPLIED TO CARRYING OUT THE PROVISIONS OF HIS WILL! This *naive* proposition does not seem to have excited the enthusiasm it was supposed it would create. Nor does it elevate Mr. Webster in the estimation of monied men That he should make a Will providing for his posterity, near and remote, *at their expense*, does not seem to strike them as a strictly business-like arrangement, while it has inordinately excited the risibilities of those that do not swear by him, as a most truly characteristic proceeding on his part. For this reason, or some other, it is said that the Subscription hangs fire badly, and that the Webster Enthusiasm will hardly stand the Money Test. Certainly, his friends would have done more wisely had they clubbed together and done the needful in the premises, without exposing him to the sneers and gibes of the unbelievers. Others, again, have been *riled* (I am not quite sure as to the orthography of this classic Americanism) by a Manifesto put forth by four or five gentlemen, styling themselves his Literary Executors (believed to be written by Mr. Sims-Commissioner Curtis), commanding all and singular who have any letters from Mr. Webster incontinently to stand and deliver them, or to take the legal consequences, whatever they may be. The Manifesto takes for granted (a point, I apprehend, not yet established) that the property in Letters remains in the Writer and does not pass to the Receiver of the same. I do not affirm, however, that even the Literary Executors claim any legal right to demand the delivery of all his letters to them, but only to forbid the publication of any, except under their supervision. This Manifesto, like the Subscription-paper, is not calculated to raise Mr. Webster in the opinion of the knowing part of the community—though it has, perhaps, the excuse of discretion. Of course, it is not intended to prevent the publication of letters creditable to Mr. Webster, but only of those *discreditable* to him. It is supposed that multitudes of letters of his exist which would not reflect much honour upon his memory, politically or professionally. Strange birds might, peradventure, come pouncing down and claim certain feathers of his, on which he especially plumed himself, as pickings and stealings from them, unless frightened away by this Scare-crow set up by the Sims-Commissioner.

This action of the Literary Executors is made the more racy, in his case, by the example which he himself set the world in the matter of Mr. Justice Story's Letters to him. You remember that Mr. William Story, when engaged in the preparation of his Father's Life, applied to Mr. Webster for his Letters, to be used as materials for the Memoir. Mr. Webster, after much shuffling and many equivocations and evasions, flatly *refused* to give up any, except a handful of the most perfectly insignificant and commonplace character. And, now, his own Executors clap the Law (as they understand it) at the breast of Mr. William Story, and of all other good men, and tell them to stand and deliver his Letters to themselves or those they represent, or to look for what is to follow! Whether they will submit to be thus entreated remains to be seen. Of course, the inevitable inference from Mr. Webster's refusal to give up Judge Story's Letters was that they would show that Mr. Webster's Constitutional Arguments were Judge Story's "thunder," much more effectually than he was able to vindicate Mr. Wilmot's Proviso as his. This is only inferential, to be sure; but it is an inference rather difficult to get away from. That there may be other vengeful ghosts hovering in the deeps of escritoirs, ready to start from their monumental sleep of parchment envelopes and red-tape bandages, to claim as theirs other of Mr. Webster's boasted trophies and "push him from his stool," may well excite the apprehensions of his friends. But they have not chosen precisely the tone or the formula that will be the most likely to exorcise them and prevent their dreaded mischief.

I have been somewhat diverted at the strictures which have been made, privately and publicly, on the Article on Mr. Webster's Death by your Corresponding Editor, as well as on one furnished by the same individual (as if one were not enough!) for the *Liberator* of the same week. While the *Courier* pronounced him "a hyena" that rejoiced in ghoul-like feasts, and an anonymous gentleman declared that he ought to be insulted in the public streets for them, the Free Soilers whose opinion I have heard expressed, almost all agreed in thinking them rather lame and not quite up to the mark. The ultra Abolitionists, on the other hand, Mr. Garrison and Mr. Phillips, and that fanatical class, were entirely satisfied with them, and thought they were stringent enough. This is my own opinion, and I feel it but just to say (although that person has given me much just cause of complaint by flagrant larcenies of *my* thunder, from time to time) that I do not think I could have done the business better myself. Having said thus much for him, I would request your readers to correct a slight typographical error in my last letter. It occurs in the third paragraph, I think, where I am made to say that the flatteries heaped upon Mr. Webster "would approach the *pathos* of the absurd, if they did not encroach on the bounds of the blasphemous," or woods to that effect. Now, it was not the "*pathos* of the absurd," but "the *bathos*," of which your calligraphic correspondent wrote. Your readers will perceive the importance of having my text in its purity, as it will save them trouble when they are taken by the throat by *my* Literary Executors.

Politics stand rather oddly here, just now. The members elected to the Legislature are just about *tied*, and the Election, week after next, will decide who shall rule over us next year. There would be no question about the continued ascendancy of the Coalition, even in spite of the Hunker Democrats, were it not for the Maine Liquor Law. These plaguy moral questions always play the deuce with parties. What in the name of common sense have Morality and Religion to do with politics? They ought to be "put down;" as Sir Peter Laurie proposed "to put down" *suicide*. The Coalitionists, however, are very sanguine of success. Whatever happens, you may rely upon having a trustworthy historian to hand down the events to the latest posterity. I have only room to add "HURRAH for Judge Paine!" Slavery seems not to have devoured *all* the Judges quite yet.—D. Y.

Miscellaneous News.

THE *Boston Post* of Tuesday gives a rumour that W. R. King, Vice President elect, is lying dangerous ill.

MR. G. P. R. JAMES delivered an oration at Boston, on Thursday of last week, on the life and military history of the Duke of Wellington.

OPIUM EATING.—It is said that a thousand pounds of opium are sold by retail every week in this city, and that the practice of opium eating is increasing very rapidly.—*Times.*

A CONTEMPORARY (says a Whig paper), while looking at the rousing majorities against us in most of the States, fears this will be known in our party history as the Big Lick Campaign.

A SON-IN-LAW of Governor Foote, of Mississippi named Thomas Carnel, was killed last week at Kentucky Bend, Miss., by a young man whose father he wounded some time since.

IT is stated in *The Voice of the Fugitive*, published in Windsor, Canada West, and edited by Henry Bibb, that the underground railroad never did a more thriving business than at present. Within ten days, the editor says, he has greeted no less than *twenty-six* from Slavery, not one of whom had met with any difficulty in making his way to Canada.

JOHN A. COLLINS, Esq., President of the Manhattan Quartz Mining Company, left for California in the Georgia, on Thursday last, expecting to be absent six or eight months. Meantime he will write regularly for *The Tribune*, (says that paper) and, having the [illegible] experience already, we expect that he will shed much light on the present state of that country—its Mining, Agriculture, Improvement and General Progress. He expected to be able to write us from San Francisco early in December.

THE REMOVAL OF FREE NEGROES.—In the report of the proceedings of the Legislature, we see that Mr. Webb, of Rutherford, offered in the North Carolina House of Commons, on the 30th ult., a resolution instructing the Committee on Finance to inquire into the most eligible plan for gradually removing free negroes from the State, and that the resolution was adopted. That the free negro population is an incubus on the body politic is generally conceded; and we believe there are few who do not desire their removal, provided it can be done without cruelty, and at a moderate expense.—*Fayetteville North Carolinian.*

On the night of the Presidential election, says the Philadelphia *Bulletin*, a coloured man named Daniel Dempsey, who was suspected (innocently, it is said), of having betrayed the fugitive slave, George Bordley, into the hands of George Alberti, was attacked in the southern part of the town by a party of blacks, and would, it is believed, have been killed, but for the interference of two white gentlemen, who protected him and kept the negroes at bay until information was given to the police—the officers, at the time, being nearly all at the election polls. Dempsey, who was shockingly wounded, was taken to the Pennsylvania Hospital. On Monday, he was able to come out. Six or eight of the blacks who assailed him, have been arrested by the Marshal's officers. Two or three of the ringleaders are in prison, and the others are

Miscellaneous Department.

ELEGY WITHOUT FICTION.

A SERMON,
Preached October 31st, 1852,
BY T. W. HIGGINSON,
Minister of the Worcester (Massachusetts) Free Church.

"I have said, ye are gods. But ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes."—*Psalms, lxxxii.* 6: 7.

I HAVE remarked to you, before, that the ancient Hebrews took a dark view of death, compared with the Egyptians, Greeks and Romans. There was a maxim among these last nations, that "whom the Gods love, die young." But the Hebrews did not think so. They thought the chief rewards and punishments of men consisted in the events of this life—that an early death was a punishment of sin, and a long life was an honour from God. If you look through the Old Testament, you will find many illustrations of this.

Nevertheless, they must all die, sooner or later. And then, the Hebrews, with their vivid oriental imaginations, saw clearly what an event the death of a distinguished man, especially, was—what a gap it seemed to make in the world—what a tremendous blow it struck at earthly pride—how instantly it transferred the power, the position, the interest, which had belonged to the most illustrious departed, from him to those left behind, inferior as those might be. "No man hath power over the spirit, to retain the spirit, neither hath he any power in the day of death."

I am struck with the impressiveness of the distinction used in the text. "Ye shall die like men." Nothing more or less than that. Nothing less, for all must die: even Jesus must have died, as to the body, and that have returned to the dust. Nothing more; for what can be more? there it is. The great man yields up his spirit, and the humble man yields up his; both go to their account. Ye shall die like *men*, only: but ye shall *fall* like *one of the princes*; ah, there is the distinction. There is no fall to the humble man; nay, the poor pauper, ignorant, friendless, helpless, during life, becomes somebody upon the event of death. Carriages, it may be, then follow, in procession, him who never even entered a carriage, or joined a procession, before; no fall for him, the world thinks. But the prince, the public officer, the eminent man, he before whom all men bowed during life, whose mere decision could save or sentence the criminal, enact a law to free the slave, or send him back to Slavery; what a change, when for him who stirred the world, there is stirred a little piece of green turf, and then the turf is replaced and grows greener next year, and that is all. Here is a fall from place and power, which man, as man merely, does not have: and so it is well written, Ye shall die as men, and fall as one of the princes of the earth. Men die, and we do not notice it; the princes of the earth fall, and we hear it; the higher the tree, the crash echoes louder.

And, as when we hear a stately tree fall, we forget that trees have been growing and falling ever since the world began; so we forget the princes of the earth who have fallen one by one. There has been no modern inscription grander than the inscription on Cleopatra's Needle, the great Egyptian Obelisk, thousands of years ago. "The glorious hero, the mighty warrior, whose actions are great upon the banner—the king of an obedient people—a man just and virtuous—beloved of the Almighty Director of the universe—who created happiness throughout his dominions. During his life, he established meetings of wise and virtuous men, in order to introduce happiness and prosperity throughout his empire. He was, therefore, exalted by the Almighty, Rhamsis, the third king, who, for his actions here below, was raised to immortality."

And yet, but for this crumbling stone, this Rhamsis would have been but one more barbarous name, on a long and tedious catalogue of kings. And, as it is, perhaps that is true of this inscription, which is true of one of the sculptures of Nineveh. It is said, that one of the bricks, brought from those famous ruins, besides the letters inscribed upon it, is marked with the footprints of a small weasel, that must have run over the brick before it dried; so that the records of the mighty king, and of the diminutive animal have been handed down upon the same piece of clay, to an equal immortality, longer or shorter.

But there are sterner lessons than these. There is no satire so bitter as the preservation of the epithets of greatness, when not only the memory of the name, but all its visible glories are past away. It is said that far in the Egyptian desert, the traveller comes, at length, upon the solitary relics of a gigantic statue. Two vast stone feet stand fixed, forever, in the sand, and, by them, lies maimed and broken, a head, with crumbling features, on which a cold, haughty sneer is still apparent. And upon this relic is this carved epithet:

"My name is Ozymindias, kings of kings,
Look on my works, ye mighty, and despair!"

Nothing beside remains; and all around, "the lone and level sands stretch far away." in vast, stern condemnation of this colossal vanity of vanities.

Ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes. We think less of born princes now; but among those promoted to high station, in this country, and in Europe, how many have recently been called away. It seems but a little while since an old man, who had seen stirring times in France, in the days of Napoleon, told me, exultingly, that there was one great sovereign in Europe, Louis Phillippe, and one great subject, the Duke of Wellington, and that he had grasped hands with both; and now both are departed, and that old man departed before them. Sir Robert Peel, too, is lately gone, the greatest, perhaps, of British statesmen, and showing his greatness in the true English way; by resisting reform, as long as possible, and then taking it up, with no parade of virtue, or foolish pretence at consistency, and carrying it through, better than any other could have—because, he said it was time now, and a wise statesman must meet every new question when its time had come. In this country, we have lost a President, during this administration; three Massachusetts Representatives in Congress; Henry Clay and Daniel Webster.

I pass over the death of President Taylor; it was two years ago—a great while in the history of this country. Nay, that of Mr. Clay, idolized as he was by many, personally the most popular of his party, and for years its real leader, is already half forgotten, and seems so far away that I had almost passed it by in my enumeration. The four Massachusetts deaths are more recent, and have followed in close succession. Of two of these, I shall not pause to speak; whatever may be the interest attending these occasions, it is merged in the more signal interest of the others; in the case of Mr. Webster, from his past position in the history of this country; in the case of Mr. Rantoul, from what would have been his future position.

I regard Mr. Rantoul as a fair specimen of the best that a man can be, and yet be a great American statesman. I mean to imply by this, that I do not think this vocation, especially in a country like ours, to be the highest position of a man. It has been strongly said by an English writer, that, to be a great statesman, requires a combination of very great and very mean qualities. I do not say this; but I do say, that to be a leading American statesman, implies an amount of compromise, to which a man of the highest order cannot consent. There is a power of management, a power of occasional concession to man's baser nature, a power of overlooking the means for the sake of the end; without which, no man can drive Freedom and Slavery, this span of black and white horses, in one rein, *even in a right direction*; but, with which, no man of the highest tone can be satisfied. I believe that Mr. Rantoul would have rapidly become, in the Democratic party, what Mr. Seward is to the Whig party; a splendid combination of skill and power, with a *minimum of compromise*—one of the *pilots* of Reform, of whom I once told you; without whom, no ship could enter port, but with whose aid alone, no ship could ever cross the ocean.

But this is much, and cannot be spared. I am told that Mr. Rantoul was rapidly rising, by his abilities and acquirements, to a leading place in the House of Representatives, and I do not doubt it. Nor do I doubt that he would have used the position well. He was committed, up to a certain point, to Anti-Slavery principle, and his heart was so far engaged in it. I think he never receded from any position in which his heart and conscience were enlisted. He has failed to go forward, sometimes, but he never went backward. He took up the Temperance cause, years ago, when it was unpopular, and got his party permanently committed on that side. These were minor tests, and he bore them well. The Anti-Slavery question was a greater test—too great for him at first. Yet, compare his position on that point, with that of most other influential politicians, and he stood well. John G. Whittier once told me of a conversation with Mr. Rantoul, held fifteen years ago, in which he told him frankly, that the Anti-Slavery principles were right, and he would advocate them, but that he thought them impracticable. "But," said he, "if I do not do this myself, *I never will denounce those who do*;" and so far as I know, unlike the rest of his party, he never did. He took office, and kept silence; but he did not denounce or ridicule those whom he felt at heart to be right. In 1848, he so far sympathized with the Free Soil movement, as to say openly, that he would support its candidate, if he believed it possible to elect him. And what he has done since, you know.

Some men are sincere when they do wrong, and others sincere when they do right: I think Mr Rantoul was of the latter class. He never professed more than he fulfilled. Some say, it was ambition, which made this last change in him. Was it so?

At the time of the fugitive slave case, in Boston, I had a conversation with Mr. Rantoul, which it interests me to recollect. I had gone to his office on an errand for the Vigilance Committee. They were attempting to obtain the execution of a civil process upon Thomas Sims, thus to take him from the United States officers, and release him upon bail; and they wished to obtain, from the Governor, the appointment of a high sheriff, who would do his duty to the Commonwealth, and serve the process, if the existing sheriff would not. Mr. Rantoul approved the proceeding, and promised his influence. This matter dismissed, he proceeded to some words about himself, having apparently been just annoyed by some fresh attacks upon him. "They say," said he, "that I am governed by ambition, in the course I am taking. Do they not know what I am sacrificing? To defend this slave case, will cost me $10,000, in the time it takes, its interference with all my other business, and the great loss of professional friends and patronage. Then, as to Congress, I cannot afford to give up my practice and go to Washington, and my friends know it. They say I am ambitious for a place in Congress, when every leading Whig in my district knows that I might have been there three years ago, if I had chosen to desert my party. If I am not acting from principle in this matter, I am acting the part of a fool, and even my opponents know that."

You must judge for yourselves how far this is exaggerated. Men exaggerate from excitement, sometimes, as well as from policy. Unquestionably Mr. Rantoul had no equal in his district, for statesman-like qualities and acquirements, and in policy had a skill in manœuvering, which was even a drawback upon his real greatness, and, in one or two cases, upon his later usefulness to freedom. These, he might have brought to bear for the benefit of the majority in his district, if he had chosen, instead of the minority. He did not, and was reserved to employ them in a better cause than that of either. I am told that no man ever made so great an impression at Washington in so short a time, and I can understand it. The House of Representatives is not a place of great men, and he had great knowledge, great readiness, great industry, no corrupt habits, and, I will add, an accomplished wife who acted as his Secretary, and was acquainted with the details of all public questions in which he was interested. Though not an original thinker, nor a man of the highest eloquence, nothing could yet have prevented him from great public distinction, if he had lived. His Anti-Slavery position, such as it was, would not have been sufficient to prevent this. The want which the Democratic party has felt, for years, of a Northern man with Northern principles, and equal to its leadership was supplied in him. No public station would have been beyond his reasonable ambition, if he had lived.

If he had lived! the one essential condition of all action; and the one which all men forget. "Who are ye that say, I will go to such a city and buy and sell; whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow." There has been no such solemn warning to ambition in our time as the death of Mr. Rantoul, if men felt such warnings; but they do not. His death was felt widely, deeply—lastingly, shall I say?—I dare not say. There was not much said; a great deal was felt. The streets did not go into mourning; but some hearts did. Public bodies did not express regret; some, perhaps, rejoiced: not that this is inconsistent with the other. We do not know, in this case, we do not know what was felt; we know what was not said. The Boston Bar, never backward to notice the death of its most insignificant members, made no allusion to the death of one of its most distinguished ones, who had been its District Attorney; a fact, which, if remembered in connexion with him, will be remembered as Cato wished a like circumstance to be, when he said that he would rather people should ask, "Why was *not* Cato's statue among those placed in the Market-place!" than "Why was it there?"

He died, and since then a different death has taken in men's minds, the place of his so that even his, seems a long while ago.

In the Scripture story, it is recorded that there were two men, of whom one said, "I go, sir," but went not; and the other, "I go not, sir," but afterwards he repented and went. It has seemed to me, that Mr. Rantoul well represented the last of the two men. Will it be the verdict of posterity that the other public officer, whose departure we are now commemorating, represented the other?

And here let me pause to lament that indiscriminating and unmanly spirit of adulation, which holds that death should wipe out the sternness of truth, and substitute a timid falsehood in its place. I can pardon silence, concerning the memory of a sinful and imperfect fellow-being, but I cannot pardon falsehood. To blame, is a serious and solemn responsibility, I know, but so it is to praise; and they should not be separated. The grave should bury personal and partizan feelings; but not moral distinctions, for they are more venerable than any man, and more precious than any personal service. Let us say nothing, or the truth. Dr. Channing well said, that, "if a man could not bear that the truth should be told of his character, light and shadow, just as it was—better pass it by." This alternative we should wish for ourselves, and this we should give to another. But it is too late to say nothing. The streets of this nation are full of memorials of virtues, attributed to the great departed. "The star of the world;" "the sum of all human greatness;" Jesus of Nazareth had no such epitaphs as these.

Speak from thine unknown sphere, oh powerful but erring human spirit, and say to this idle adulation, Silence, or Truth!

I hardly feel free to comment, at length, upon the position and character of Mr. Webster; not because of his greatness, only; for he was a weak mortal, and what less are we? but for other reasons. Nothing is so hard, as for a person to do justice to the characters, services, and circumstances, of those about a half century his elders. They are too near, and yet too far away. Just too near to be criticised as historical characters, for the personal feeling has not had time to subside; just too far off to be understood as contemporaries. I must leave the scales of justice in elder hands, at this time, and for younger hands by and by, and say but a little, and that cautiously and humbly.

Let me pass hastily over the lower standards by which Mr. Webster is to be tried; his intellectual claims as a statesman, a lawyer, and an orator.

It is a maxim, that the test of a statesman, as of a general, lies not in his plans, but in their success. Tried by this standard, Mr. Webster failed. He early advocated free trade, unsuccessfully; he then advocated a tariff, under a tremendous fire of reproach for his change, and unsuccessfully; he unsuccessfully defended the U. S. Bank, and lived to pronounce it an obsolete idea. He aimed, successfully, to prevent a war with England, on the boundary question. Was this a great success? I doubt. Is not the slave power a sufficient guarantee against a war with England, by which it has nothing to gain? It will ally itself with the buccaneering spirit of the West, to conquer Mexico and Cuba, for Slavery. It will as readily ally itself with the mercantile spirit of our Eastern cities, to prevent a war which would result only in annexing Canada for freedom. It is no test of a great statesman, to induce people to do as they wish. Mr. Rantoul showed some power, when he induced the Massachusetts Democracy to go, even so far as they have gone, towards freedom, for they did not wish to do it. Mr. Webster had no opportunity of showing great power, in preserving peace with England, for both countries desired it. This does not seem to me, therefore, a great success.

Again, Mr. Webster advocated two noble causes, perhaps the best causes he ever consistently sustained; the cause of Hungary, and the freedom of the Western lands to actual settlers. But he advocated both unsuccessfully; neither has prevailed in our legislation. Finally, he had tried, irregularly and occasionally to rouse the North for freedom; he did it unsuccessfully; he suddenly changed his ground, endeavoured to bend it to Slavery, and was unsuccessful in that. The attempt to nominate him for the Presidency, was unsuccessful, and the desperate attempt to make a final demonstration in his favour, was arrested by a message sent from his death-bed. Strange coincidence! that that message should have been signed by the hand which did sign it; the hand that bore upon it, at Mr. Webster's bidding, the darkest stain of any in Massachusetts; the hand which signed the certificate which a year before sent back Thomas Sims, a chained slave, from the free city of Boston. I speak it in sorrow, not in anger; but history never forgets retributions like this. Judged by success, then, he was not a great statesman. The skill and tactics of the Whig party lay in the versatile brain and ready will of Clay and of others; Mr. Webster supplied its argument and its administrative skill. In the midst of the ignorance and vulgarity that have disgraced our public proceedings, his vigour, knowledge, and clearness, have stood forth conspicuous, and helped to keep up the intellectual standard of our statesmanship. His State papers and letters—although, his one singular mistake about the discovery of the Lobos Islands would have crushed the administrative reputation of a lesser man—were models in their kind, and probably unequalled in this generation.

There is but one way in which a statesman can hope to obtain permanent reputation, except by success, and that is consistency. Tried by this test, also, Mr. Webster failed. Inconsistent on the Tariff, inconsistent on the Bank, his crowning inconsistency was on the one great question of the day—Slavery. His foresight was tried here and found wanting. He changed his position here. Setting morality aside, and speaking only the language of the intellect, posterity will say of him, as Napoleon said, "It was worse than a crime, it was a blunder." There is not a shadow of question that Mr. Webster was, at one period, very near to identifying himself with the Anti-Slavery agitation. Nay, long before he deplored the want of a North in Congress (the most *sectional* thing ever said by Northern men there), he seemed to hold this position. For, I have it from reliable authority, that years ago, during a contested election in the old Third District, when John G. Whittier was the Liberty candidate, Mr. Webster, in a conversation at Lowell, advised some of his friends to support him, with this expressive addition, "It is the ground we have all got to come to, sooner or later." Who can tell the consequence, had he come to it then? He failed, and lived to exhibit that which Lord John Russell pronounced to be the one thing worse than the cant of Reform, its melancholy *recant*.

As a lawyer, I cannot of course speak of him, but by reputation. Yet the law in his hands was more than it seems in those of many great lawyers; it seemed to be with him a study of principles as well precedents, and his speeches belong to literature, at least, if not to philanthropy. There is a remarkable felicity of handling shown in them, and an attraction is thrown around the subjects least familiar to popular interest. A remarkable instance of this, was his argument in the late India rubber case; one of the few legal arguments, not involving a human life or a moral principle, which the general reader peruses with unflagging interest, through the mere brilliancy and vigour of the statement.

But it takes a rare fascination, rarer than this, to carry such speeches, or speeches on greater occasions, down to the next generation, and when one asks in calm reflection, will Mr. Webster's addresses be permanently read, the answer remains uncertain. I suppose that no department of literature, not even sermons, are so swiftly left behind, as speeches. Written for the ear, not the eye; they pass away with the audiences that heard them; even the printing press cannot save them. To write at once for the ear and eye is the rarest of all gifts. To have at the same time the power of original thought, and the power to condense that thought into a form of absolute, permanent beauty, is the very rarest of combinations, and yet posterity will accept nothing less. Many men have moments of inspiration; snatches of their high thoughts are murmured into music and remembered; but who are those whose eloquence has habitually this perfect power? I can think of but two such voices, which this country and generation has heard; there is Kossuth, and there is Wendell Phillips. I can hardly hope that any other contemporary eloquence will be long remembered, and I am not sure even of theirs.

Mr. Webster's personal appearance was the most remarkable which this generation has looked upon; his mere presence was an oration. But these things cannot be commemorated, and their record fades. Only genius lives, and genius consecrated to highest aims. Thought and beauty; these are remembered in literature; the philosopher and the poet—and so far as the orator is either of these, he is remembered, and no farther. Plato and Homer: these are read; they are as great facts in memory as in their lives; Demosthenes is a far off echo only. I think the writings of Webster will stand by those of Fisher Ames, and Hamilton, and John Adams, in libraries; but the smallest contribution from a deep original thinker, is not left to stand in libraries; it becomes a part of the current thought and language of men. The pages of Burnyon, for instance, [illegible] with statements of absolute truth, stretching into the very core of society, and the very life of man's soul; these are what make up permanent literature; the most magnificent contemporary reputation cannot save writings which do not contain this one priceless ore. There is a terrible inaccuracy in the contemporary judgments of men, and as formidable an accuracy in their final decisions. Shakspeare, the one intellectual prodigy of the world, and whom the best intellects of the world exhaust themselves in criticising, was not even enumerated among the men of his time, by Lord Bacon, who took the census of its attainments. And Milton stands recorded by contemporaries as "a tedious old blind schoolmaster," and again as "the blind adder who spit his venom on the King's sacred person." What hope, after this, can any contemporary judgments of ours have, that they will stand as the permanent voice of humanity? We must hazard them as guesses, and so leave them.

Moreover, all this is *intellectual* criticism—only that; and now that it has been spoken, let it be set aside again; let it go for nothing; let us pass to other things. Let the idol expand again to its former size; still, the stern questions remains. Is it an idol, or is it a God! Grant all that can be claimed of intellectual power, however extravagant; still remains the question: What is the value of it all? Bacon was called wisest, brightest, *meanest*, of mankind; perhaps it was not true of him; but the combination might be possible. Is greatness of intellect the greatest greatness? Can it cover the charge of selfish ambition? Can it cover the sudden change from a love of freedom, flickering indeed, but sincere, to a blind, servile concentration of all faculties in opposing the cause of freedom? Can it cover private vices—charges so often made, that it would be virtual falsehood not to allude to them—of intemperance, licentiousness, bribery, pecuniary untrustworthiness? Charges like these cannot be ignored; they must be MET. When the subdued, dissatisfied voice of the world makes them, it is not enough for us, a younger race, to whom you hold up this strong man as an angel—it is not enough to ignore them. We cannot prove them all perhaps; or if we could, have no desire to do so now; but they cast a shade across the flame of your incense, which will not move away. Surely, an American statesman, like Cæsar's wife of old, should not even be suspected. All are not suspected. Mr. Calhoun passed through an eventful life, changed his party, sustained the worst cause ever sustained by a public man in this country, and yet no breath of suspicion was ever lifted against him upon such charges. Why is it otherwise here? I would not speak of these things, did not others speak and write them; but I have a right to ask, in the name of every young man of this nation, who wishes to lead a noble life; in the name of truth, and purity, and manhood; how is it that you dare to build an idol like this for us, that we, in our hour of greatest need, may go to it, and find it only clay?

I may be wrong, but I have always believed that the most solemn warning ever given to the young men of this nation, as to the impossibility of combining private sin with public virtue, has been the career of Mr. Webster. I believe that his personal habits and expenditures have been the weight that kept him from ascending to the great work of a true American statesman, and finally dragged him down to earth, on that disastrous March day. A man cannot be impure and sensual, without corrupting his moral nature; a man cannot be profuse and dissolute, and avoid becoming dependent (if he be in public life), on the favour of the rich and powerful. Could Mr. Webster have freed himself from these—have ceased to need "the optimists and quietists," he would have ceased to do their bidding; but this, only a change in the habits of years could have effected. If he could have done this, the really noble impulses which were always, perhaps, first in his large nature, would have borne him aloft as the balloon soars, when the weights are cut away which hold it; keep them uncut, and the great machine, half inflated, rolls restless and uneasy from side to side, and then collapses, despairing; and the crowd can only say: What an ascension this might have been! *Might have been!* the saddest of all epitaphs.

Not anger, not sarcasm, not petty criticism, is meet for an occasion like this; nay, the time has long passed when it was fitting. The true tragedy of Daniel Webster was at its crisis, long months ago; they who had tears, should have prepared them then—not now; this is only the end of the *epilogue*, which comes after the tragedy. Whittier struck the key note of the voice of Massachusetts and of posterity, long since, in that wonderful poem, which may yet be remembered longer than its subject:

ICHABOD.

Revile him not—the Tempter hath
A snare for all;
And pitying tears, not scorn and wrath,
Befit his fall!

O! dumb be passion's stormy rage,
When he who might
Have lighted up and led his age,
Falls back in night.

Let not the land, once proud of him,
Insult him now,
Nor brand with deeper shame, his dim
Dishonoured brow.

But let its humbled sons, instead,
From sea to lake,
A long lament, as for the dead,
In sadness make.

Then pay the reverence of old days
To his dead fame;
Walk backward, with averted gaze,
And hide the shame.

Young men who hear me—do not let them deceive you. A great man has fallen; but his greatest fall was long ago. The land seems filled with mourning; but so it has publicly mourned within our memory, for Harrison, for Adams, for Taylor, for Clay. Soon shall those mournful inscriptions be laid aside; the black crape and cloth be folded away for other purposes, or be sold perhaps to the highest bidder. The tide of life is very swift, and will close again over the sorrow for Webster; and the grand sculpture by Powers, be the best remembrances of that greatness. Men will be absorbed in their own achievements and sins, and forget his. No, they will not forget all that he did which was well done; time will unerringly select it out, and build it into the young life of the nation; and who knows but that strong spirit, purified gradually from its errors, may yet watch beside this world, permitted to help the operation of all the influence it exerted here for good, and counteract some of the evil. Who knows but it was the better nature, still struggling in that great misguided soul, which exclaimed, "I yet live," in those dying hours; in answer to a voice like that which spoke to Moses, when he too departed ere entering the Promised Land, and said unto him, "Come up higher!"

THE DISCOVERER OF STEAM NAVIGATION.

THE following article [says the *Glasgow Examiner*], from the pen of the editor, appeared in a recent number of our able contemporary, the *Scottish Press*, and will no doubt be read with interest. The editor of that journal has, we know, taken great pains to verify every statement made in the article, and has been furnished by the widow and children of the late Mr Taylor with the originals of all the documents quoted We have omitted some matter not essential to the completeness of the narrative.

It seems a singular circumstance that the world should not have pronounced authoritatively who the man was that completely revolutionised our ocean and inland navigation, and by the application of steam to vessels economised time, minimised space, and almost bridged the ocean—and promoted those discoveries in railway locomotion which connect cities and continents, and promise soon to girdle the world and bind the nations in one with ligatures of iron. We do not mean to say that men need to stand in doubt, or that those intelligent spirits who have given themselves fully and impartially to the investigation do stand in doubt, as to the identity of the discoverer; but unfortunately, in this practical age, few busy themselves to discover the truth of an abstraction for themselves, and not a few are led away by every loud boaster who substitutes boldness of assertion for force of argument and investigation. We deem the subject important as a matter of history, as a valuable chapter in science, as a question of justice to the discoverer, be he whom he may, and as an affair affecting the credit, renown, and even good faith of this country. The time will come when men will not be able to settle the question as they can do now, because, while the documentary evidence upon which the investigation rests may remain, the relative value which belongs to the individual testimony will, to a certain extent, pass away. We are challenged to make good our claim on behalf of Mr. James Taylor, of Cumnock, to be the discoverer of the application of steam to the propulsion of vessels. We undertake the task with alacrity, for two reasons: first, we never were more fully persuaded of the truth of any matter depending upon historical evidence; and second, there is a sacredness in defending the dead which the living can scarcely claim.

It will [illegible] be contended by persons who know *anything* of the controversy, that either the American, Mr Fulton, or Mr. Henry Bell, of Helensburgh, was the discoverer. This has been done; but the impudent pretension would not bear investigation. That these men were the first to introduce steam to general use, the one when he launched a steamer on the Hudson in 1807, and the other on the Clyde in 1812, we freely admit—but it is not now disputed that they obtained the idea of the invention when, on a visit to the Carron Works, they were, at their own request, permitted to inspect the steamboat which had been fitted up on the Forth and Clyde Canal, but discontinued because of the injury which it caused to the banks—and which idea had been carried to a practical result nineteen years before Fulton's American steamboat was launched, when in 1788 the first successful experiment was made on Dalswinton Loch, in Dumfriesshire. We make these remarks that we may not be encumbered in the subsequent discussion by the apocryphal claims of Messrs. Fulton and Bell.

It is universally admitted that the little steamer, which was launched on Dalswinton Loch on the 14th of October, 1788, was the inaugural step of that mighty discovery which, as we have said, was to revolutionise the traffic, relations, and ideas of the world. And the question we have to discuss is, whose invention was it?—who of the three men—for there were admittedly only three who were engaged in adapting that little engine, with its four-inch cylinder and its frame upon the deck—originated the plan—whether was it Mr. Miller, of Dalswinton, the patron, or Mr. James Taylor, the family tutor, who had been recommended because, among other accomplishments, he was "passionately fond" of mechanics—or Mr. Wm. Symington, the young engineer, who was employed to construct the engine used on the occasion? Whether this question be of clear or doubtful issue, it is the whole question, and it is a comfort to know that our attention need not be distracted with other inquiries. Indeed, we might almost narrow the inquiry by excluding Mr. Miller's name; for, beyond the circumstance that his handwheel led to the investigation which resulted in the discovery, and that he was the party who supplied the means, neither Mr. Miller nor his representatives have been emolous of a large share in the invention.

We have no hesitation in stating our confident belief that to Mr. James Taylor belongs the distinction of being the discoverer. We shall state what, on an examination, intended to be impartial, and which could have no bias, and from a mass of documents, to enumerate which would seem like parade, we hold to be facts of the case, and the grounds upon which we justify our opinion.

Mr. Miller, of Dalswinston, a retired Edinburgh banker, and a man of an enterprising but somewhat speculative turn, being in want of a resident tutor for his two younger sons, had had recommended to him, by his friend Mr. Fergusson, of Craigdarroch, Mr. James Taylor, "as a man of general knowledge, with whom he might converse upon all subjects." This engagement was formed in 1785, in the autumn of which year Mr. Taylor went to reside in the family of Mr. Miller. That gentleman was at the time engaged in a series of experiments on shipping. The double or twin vessel seemed to be that which interest him most. In the summer of 1786, Mr. Taylor was present at several experiments at Leith with the double vessel, feeling little interest in his patron's schemes, except as affording a little pleasurable excitement. In the spring of 1787, however, he attended Mr. Miller in a sailing match between a Custom House wherry and the twin boat, the latter being propelled by two wheels, each turned by two men. These two wheels formed the original idea of the paddles of the steamboat, but the question was whether a power could be discovered to turn the wheels, which would supersede the exhausting labour performed by men, and of which Mr. Taylor was well able to form an estimate from having, during the excitement of the race, taken a spell at the wheel-turning himself. What was wanted, then, was a power to supersede and surpass animal power; and that Mr. Miller at this time neither knew nor had heard of any such power, his letter to Mr. Taylor makes abundantly evident. That this was the desideratum, without which the experiment would prove useless, Mr. Taylor had insisted on, and Mr. Miller, in a written communication to him, coincides in the opinion: "I want," he says, "a power more extensively useful, which I have not as yet been able to attain; now that you understand the subject, will you lend me the aid of your head, and see if you can suggest any plan to accomplish my purpose?" At last, after beating over the whole range of mechanics, Mr. Taylor suggested the steam engine. Mr. Miller held the suggestion to be ingenious, but impracticable, and met the proposal by a whole host of objections. But the more Mr. Miller objected, the more did Mr. Taylor feel satisfied of its adaptation. To fix the date beyond all controversy, Mr. Miller wrote a narrative in the summer of 1787 of his experiments; but not being assured of the success of the steam discovery, which was yet only theoretical, he made no reference to it, until persuaded by Mr. Taylor, and there it stands on record, defying all cavil. Of this work copies were sent to the government, the members of parliament, and to all the maritime powers in Europe and America. In the winter of 1787, Mr. Miller went to Edinburgh, accompanied by Mr. Taylor, and being full of the discovery, made estimtaes of the expense requisite to give it a trial, and desired Mr. Taylor to find out a practical engineer to perform the mechanical work, when it fortunately happened that Mr. William Symington, and old friend and school-fellow of his, was then in Edinburgh, following out his education. Indeed, Taylor had evidently communicated his discovery to Symington some months before, and the latter being himself an ingenious mechanist, who had succeeded in inventing a new construction of the steam engine by throwing off the air-pump, was the very man wanted. We find a letter from Mr. Symington dated from Wanlockhead, where he was usually employed at the lead mines, to Mr. Taylor, at Dalswinton, which is not merely valuable for its date, but as containing irrefragable evidence that Symington considered the invention, however it might turn out, to be Taylor's. In this letter, in talking of some other affair, he says: "I believe neither this sheet nor my time, will allow me to expatiate at any length on this subject, seeing I must make some remarks on *your summer's invention*, which, if made to perform what *its author* gives it out for, *will undoubtedly be one of the greatest wonders hitherto presented to the world*, besides being of considerable emolument to the projector. *Great success to you*, though overturning my schemes; but take care we do not come upon your back, and run away with them by some improvement." The italics are ours, not the writer's.

Mr. Taylor did not return to Dalswinton after the college rose, but remained in town to superintend the castings, &c., which were done in brass by Mr. George Watt, a founder at the back of Shakspeare Square. Syminton and he proceeded afterwards to Dalswinton, and by October they accomplished the mounting of the engine on the deck of a large double pleasure boat upon the lake. A great many spectators turned out to see the trial, not a few of them imagining, doubtless, that the fire-ship would explode, and vessel and engine go to the bottom. Among the spectators was Mr. Monteath, of Closeburn, who, writing long afterwards (5th April, 1834), says, after alluding to Mr. Miller's famous twin-boat with a wheel between them, "he employed manual labour to drive the wheel, which being found insufficient, Mr. James Taylor, at that time tutor to Mr. Miller's sons, I have always understood, suggested the notion of employing a steam engine to put the wheel in motion, and proposed the ingenious mechanic, Symington, to construct a small engine for the purpose of putting in motion the small boat, launched upon a lake in the vicinity of the house at Dalswiton, which I saw, to the best of my recollection, in the year 1788." Whatever were the expectations of the on-lookers, the boat moved beautifully, and, notwithstanding the smallness of the cylinders, was propelled at the rate of five miles an hour. An admirable drawing of the engine, and its mode of connection with the paddle-wheels, made by Mr. Taylor, is in our possession. This was the first voyage ever performed by steam. Behold how great a matter the little fire has kindled! The innumerable steamships which crowd every dock, and thread their way on the bosom of every river, and snort and roar as they fling aside the spray while tracking their course from continent to continent, owe their origin to the successful experiment on Dalswinton loch. Stop, reader! The man who made the discovery died penniless, and his venerable widow is pensioned with the magnificent grant of £50 per annum. Had he but invented an engine of human destruction, more destructive than any hitherto known, he would have been made a peer, and the nation would have sung pæans over him. Taylor *only* applied steam to navigation, and was allowed to die in poverty, a consummation alike flattering to our national taste and discrimination, and a salutary warning to men of science and skill, how they attempt to turn their talents to the welfare of their country!

The rest of our tale may be soon told. It was intended to cover the invention of steam navigation by a patent; but before taking this final step Mr. Taylor was despatched to Carron Foundry, accompanied by Mr. Symington, to construct another engine, and in the summer of next year (1798) they fitted up a vessel of considerable size with an engine, of which the cylinder measured eighteen inches in diameter. This vessel was placed on the Forth and Clade Canal, but the paddle-boards being weakly constructed, they gave way when the engine received full play, and the experiment, although perfectly successful, was cut short. The paddles being re-constructed, the vessel went with ease at the rate of seven miles an hour, and the whole movements were as perfect as in the best constructed steamboats up to this day.

Mr. Miller, who, notwithstanding his public spirit and courage, was erratic and susceptible of new impulses, felt annoyed by what he considered the unnecessary extravagance displayed by the engineer and others in conducting the experiments, and showed little desire to follow up the discoveries. Mr. Taylor attempted to prevail upon him to avail himself of the benefit of them, but to no purpose. But for the war in Austria, however, Mr. Taylor had every prospect of being invited to introduce them on the continent, through the kindly interference of the Craigdarroch family.

In 1801, Mr. Symington fitted up an experimental steam vessel, under Lord Dundee's auspices, on the canal, but which was forbidden on account of the injury done to the banks by the wave; and it was from the inspection of this boat, when laid up in ordinary, that Messrs. Fulton and Bell, who visited it in company, took the idea of their steamers. Symington, seeing that nothing was done either on behalf of Mr. Miller or Taylor to protect the invention, himself applied covertly for a patent; but Mr. Taylor, on being made aware of the circumstance, compelled Symington, by formal missive, dated Glasgow, 9th February, 1821, to convey to him the half of the interests and proceeds. The document is only valuable as showing Mr. Symington's own convictions, for neither interests nor proceeds were ever realized. After the discovery had proved itself to be of such vast practical value, Mr. Taylor drew up in 1824 a statement, a copy of which lies before us, addressed to a select committee of the House of Commons on steamboats, &c., but it seems to have been disregarded; and, depressed and disappointed, he sunk under the pressure of accumulated misfortunes, and died on the 18th of September, 1825, at the age of sixty-eight.

A correspondent says that in 1786 Mr. Symington had applied steam successfully to the propulsion of land carriages, that he had exhibited a model of his invention at Edinburgh, that one of the persons who examined it was Mr. Miller, and that he (Symington) it was who suggested the application of the same power to Mr. Miller's double vessel. Now, we have evidence under Mr. Miller's own hand, that in 1787, a year later, he applied to Mr. Taylor to lend him his aid to discover "a power more extensively useful" than he had yet attained—that Mr. Symington wrote to Mr. Taylor, congratulating him on *his* "inventions;" that Mr. Patrick Miller, who must have known his father's opinions well, says to Mr. Taylor, "I assign you the place of suggestor of, and sole coadjutor to my father, in this important improvement." "Symington had nothing to do with its principle, and was nothing more than the mere mechanic who placed the machinery in the vessel;" that Mr. Monteath's testimony, already quoted, is to the same effect; that the Rev. D. Kennedy, of Kirkmichael, says, "I never heard it disputed during the time I was in Dumfriesshire, that Mr. Taylor was the original inventor of the steamboat; it was only at or about the time of Mr. Taylor's death that I heard that Symington appeared as a competitor, who, in my opinion, has not the slightest claim to the invention;" and, finally and conclusively, that Mr. Alexander Nasmyth, a man as distinguished for probity as in art, declared in a formal written testimony that he was present when the suggestion was first made by Mr. Taylor, and heard the latter propose Mr. Symington as a person qualified to construct the necessary machinery. Mr. Nasmyth's declaration is dated, "Edinburgh, 47, York Place, 7th April, 1834." .. ..

Sir John Robinson and Sir John G. Dalzell furnished select papers to the Royal Society of Arts, for which they publicly received thanks, assigning the discovery to Mr. Taylor, and lamenting, not only that he was allowed "to languish in obscurity, to die unnoticed and unknown, but his widow and daughters (to) have been hitherto overpassed in any adequate remuneration—a reproach which falls as heavy on the nation this day as when it was first uttered. Our eminent townsman, Professor Forbes, says (3d May, 1842) he had carefully studied the history of steam navigation, and his impressions were, "that the merit of the invention of steam navigation is due to Mr. James Taylor and to Mr. Miller, of Dalswinton, jointly. That the actual suggestion was Mr. Taylor's, there seems no reason to doubt. That he was aware of the importance of the invention to mankind, and pushed it into notice when Mr. Miller had abandoned it, is clear from the evidence. Everyone acquainted with the subject is aware that the claims of Symington and Fulton to the invention of steam navigation are unfounded." Then, finally, take the testimony of Mr. Geddes, the eminent civil engineers, from a letter which he addressed to Mrs. Taylor in May, 1842, in which he says "to your husband belongs the merit of first suggesting a steam engine as a propeller of vessels by its giving motion to the paddlewheels," and "your husband, in originating the four-inch cylinder engine there employed, laid the foundation of the immense extent and power of steam-boats that now ply on every sea, river, and loch."

Mr. Taylor's widow still survives, residing in our city, a venerable lady, sensitively alive to her husband's honour in this matter, and on whom the nation bestows the munificent pension of £50 per annum! Is there no government patriotic enough—Whig or Tory, for there are no politics in this matter—to step in and do a simple act of justice by bestowing a pension on this gentlewoman, which would cheer and comfort her few remaining years; and, given in remainder to her daughters, would at once piece them beyond the reach of want, and give them more than a filial pride in being descended from the discoverer of a physical